THE REALITY OF THE REGIMES IN THE ARABIAN PENINSULA FROM THE SCALES OF ISLAM

A reflection on the state of the regimes in Arabian Peninsula and the Muslim World from Morocco to Indonesia & from Turkey to Yemen

- Booklet originally written in Arabic with the specific situation of Kingdom of Al Salul , but applicable to the entire Muslim populated countries and situation is **far worst today**

Introduction

Praise be to Allah, and peace and blessings be upon the Messenger of Allah ﷺ

Despite the abundance of debate surrounding the evaluation of the Saudi system from a religious (Sharia) perspective, no systematic and disciplined evaluative study has been published on this issue, despite its importance and the urgent need for it.

Most of those who engage in discussing this issue rely on isolated pieces of evidence or specific incidents, and they cling to the ظاهر(apparent meanings) of some religious texts without considering their broader implications, without taking into account other relevant texts, and without understanding the objectives of Sharia regarding the issue of leadership and governance in Islam. Nor do they compare these principles with the reality in which the system exists. This method of addressing such a sensitive and complex religious issue is a

serious mistake, and it leads to incorrect conclusions as a result.

The second problem is that much of this discussion takes place within the sphere of influence of the Saudi ruling system, which makes neutrality in the debate nearly impossible.
Consequently, accuracy in conclusions cannot be achieved. The problem is not merely the intimidation exercised by the ruling authority, but also the presence of a religious establishment that adopts a particular approach in legitimizing the Saudi system. Opposing this establishment is extremely difficult—almost impossible—because the consequences and repercussions of such opposition often come from it even before they come from the ruling authority itself.

Another issue that occurs in studies of political legitimacy is their focus on the legitimacy of the individual ruler without considering the legitimacy of the governing system itself. As a

result, they corner themselves into two options: either to endorse the ruler completely or to declare him an unbeliever. This is an unacceptable oversimplification of the issue of legitimacy and amounts to implicit intellectual coercion. It effectively narrows the scope of Sharia and its great objectives concerning governance and leadership.

A related problem is the tendency to tie the issue of legitimacy directly to the issue of armed rebellion against the ruler, treating taking up arms as an immediate obligation for those who view the system as illegitimate.

Linking the issue of legitimacy to declaring disbelief (takfīr) and taking up arms—and the serious consequences that arise from these two matters—has led many people to avoid addressing this topic altogether, or to discuss it only under the influence of these implications. This, in turn, results in a lack of fairness and sound methodology in reasoning and drawing conclusions.

For all these reasons, it became necessary to present a comprehensive and methodical study of this issue—one that goes beyond reductionism and oversimplification, beyond relying on a single religious text or judging merely the person of the ruler. Instead, it should provide a detailed framework for evaluating legitimacy through an understanding of the pillars of

legitimate leadership (imamate), upon which Islamic governance is based. Then, the practices of the Saudi system can be assessed against these pillars, and only then can its position in relation to Sharia be properly determined.

This study was originally published in installments in the bulletin *Al-Huqūq* issued by the "Committee for the Defense of Legitimate Rights," and parts of it were also published in the magazine *Al-Shar'iyyah* issued by the same body. It was later considered beneficial to compile, refine, review, and expand upon it, and then present it in this booklet.

In this study, care has been taken to present the material in a clear and systematic scholarly manner, relying on evidence from the Qur'an and the Sunnah, verifying hadiths, and attributing the statements of scholars to their proper sources. The structure of this work is organized into several sections: first, a general introduction establishing essential legal principles necessary for understanding

the rest of the study; followed by several sections discussing the pillars of legitimate leadership and the position of the Saudi system in relation to them; then a section on the ruling regarding those who defend the system; and finally, the study concludes with responses to a number of doubts and misconceptions concerning the issue of legitimacy.

We ask God to make this work a means of clarifying many of the ambiguities that have confused Muslims and preachers regarding this sensitive issue, and to grant success to all in contributing toward the establishment of legitimate leadership in its correct form.

We also ask Him, Glorified be He, to help us purify our intentions, correct our actions, and gladden our eyes with the empowerment of this religion. Indeed, He is the One capable of that and able to bring it about. May God send His prayers and peace upon our master Muhammad ﷺ, and upon his family and companions.

General Introduction

The correct legal ruling (ḥukm sharʿī) on any issue, incident, or case cannot be known except through two kinds of understanding:

First, understanding the reality; and second, understanding the ruling of Allah concerning it. As Ibn al-Qayyim (may Allah have mercy on him) said:

“It is not possible for the mufti or the judge to give a fatwa or a ruling accurately except through two types of understanding: one of them is understanding the reality of the case, and deriving knowledge of what actually occurred through indications, signs, and evidence until he fully comprehends it; and the second is understanding what is required in that reality—namely, understanding the

ruling of Allah that He has established in His Book or through the words of His Messenger regarding that situation, and then applying one to the other."[1]

Similarly, Ibn Taymiyyah stated, when asked about the ruling on the Tatars, that the legal judgment is based on two principles: first, knowledge of their condition; and second, knowledge of Allah's ruling concerning people like them.[2]

It was initially assumed that the reluctance of students of knowledge and scholars to issue a legal ruling regarding the Saudi system—and political systems in general—was due to their lack of understanding of the first aspect (understanding reality). This was thought to be the result of the system obscuring its true nature and concealing it behind a set of outward

embellishments. Therefore, exposing these practices and policies—of which many students of knowledge were unaware—was considered the most important role. Scholars have unanimously agreed on the obligation of exposing the hypocrite and the innovator.[3]

Imam Ahmad was asked: "Is it more beloved to you that a man fasts, prays, and performs spiritual retreat, or that he speaks against the people of innovation?" He replied: "If he stands, prays, and makes retreat, it is only for himself; but if he speaks against the people of innovation, it is for the Muslims—this is better."[4]

Despite the large number of students of knowledge in the land of the Two Holy Mosques, their preoccupation with

studying and seeking knowledge has distanced them from understanding reality and its true nature. This is something that can occur among students of knowledge and scholars, as a number of the early generations warned about. Among them was Ibn Taymiyyah (may Allah have mercy on him), who discussed this issue in many places within his legal writings (fatwas).

It has become clear that many scholars and students of knowledge have refrained from applying the ruling of Allah to this reality. The reasons for this reluctance vary. Some of them have accepted for themselves the position of mere imitation (taqlīd), waiting for others to undertake this task so that they may follow after them in this virtue. Others fear the consequences that may

result from such application, believing that stating the ruling of Allah concerning the system would lead to a trial (fitnah) whose consequences are unknown. It is as though this group assumes that knowing the ruling of Allah is something harmful that must be concealed and hidden.

Concerning such people, Muhammad ibn Waddah (may Allah have mercy on him) said: “The Children of Israel were only destroyed at the hands of their scholars and jurists, and this nation will likewise be destroyed at the hands of its scholars and jurists.”[5] Yet the ruling of Allah is, in reality, the true path to salvation and happiness.

In light of this, it becomes necessary to discuss in detail the true nature of the system, the ruling of Allah regarding it, where it stands within the religion of Allah, and what the position of the Muslim community toward it should be, and how it should deal with it—that is, to address both aspects: reality and Sharia.

Before beginning this discussion, it is necessary to establish some

foundational principles so that matters are not confused or misunderstood. These principles are as follows:

First: No ruling or belief is to be accepted except with a valid religious proof. The proof in Islamic law is the Qur'an, the Sunnah, and the understanding of the Companions and those who followed them from the best generations. Anything other than that is not an independent proof; rather, it itself requires evidence. Everything outside the Qur'an, Sunnah, and consensus (ijmā') is considered opinion, and opinion may be correct or incorrect—it may be accepted or rejected.

Therefore, researching the issue of the legitimacy of a system, like other religious matters, must be based on

clear evidence and an accurate understanding of reality. Although this principle appears self-evident and beyond dispute, in reality it has become neglected, despite being frequently repeated by scholars. Some raise the slogan: “Everything outside the text and consensus is opinion, and opinion is not binding.” Yet in practice, they treat the opinions of jurists and judges as if they were binding religious law. They even consider opposing such opinions a sin—indeed, a major sin.

At times, they disregard clear religious evidence and rely instead on weak and unfounded arguments that resemble the speech of common people, such as: “We are better than others,” or “Do not disturb our security, stability, and comfortable living.”

This leads them to selectively pick weak and isolated opinions that have no connection to sound evidence, in order to justify the actions of the system and give it an appearance of legitimacy in a way that would not even be acceptable to a beginner student of knowledge, let alone a scholar. One is struck by the strangeness of such people: they cling to religious texts regarding issues such as menstruation, childbirth, and zakat al-fitr, yet they turn away from clear legal rulings concerning major issues of governance, politics, and judiciary—matters that concern the entire الأمةcollectively.

Second: Judging a system is not the same as judging individuals within it. Rather, it is a judgment on the system as a system of governance, regardless of individuals within it. A general

judgment may apply to some individuals, but this does not mean it applies to all individuals in all circumstances. This is a well-known principle among students of knowledge.[6] The discussion is not about specific persons, but about the ruling on the system itself and its position in relation to Islam. Therefore, one should not object by pointing to the presence of some righteous individuals within it, nor should the discussion later shift to judging specific individuals, because the subject is the legitimacy of the entire entity and its degree of closeness or distance from Sharia.

It is well known that ruling bodies and groups are generally judged in religion based on their overall nature, regardless of individual cases within them.[7]

Third: The ruling of Allah regarding any issue cannot be derived from a single text when others exist on the matter; rather, all relevant evidences must be taken into account. Those who rely on some texts while ignoring others are people of innovation. Most innovators take some texts and reject others, as is the case with the Qadariyyah, Jahmiyyah, and Khawarij, following the path of imitation in this regard, resembling the Jews about whom Allah said: “Do you believe in part of the Book and disbelieve in part?”

As for Ahl al-Sunnah, they are the people of guidance, and their method is

to apply all texts without neglecting any of them, after verifying their authenticity.

This is what applies to those who ignore some authentic prophetic hadiths in their strong efforts to defend the system and governance. Why is it that they overlook hadiths such as: “You will surely enjoin him upon the truth with firmness”?[8] And why do they neglect the hadiths commanding enjoining good and forbidding evil? These prophetic texts are consistent with one another and must all be taken together when determining the Muslim’s position toward any ruler, regardless of who that ruler may be.

Fourth: The religion of Allah is a comprehensive religion; nothing in the affairs of this world or the Hereafter

falls outside its domain. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ, who taught us even how to eat and drink—indeed, matters more precise than that—is it conceivable that the most serious affairs, such as politics and governance, would be left to people to manipulate rulings under the claim of political necessity or supposed public interest?

Therefore, whoever believes that a ruler has the right to enact legislation and laws that contradict the religion of Allah, and then obligates people to follow them, is without doubt a disbeliever and apostate, as stated by the scholars. Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab said:

“These tyrants (ṭawāghīt), whom people believe must be obeyed besides Allah, are all disbelievers and apostates from

Islam. How could it be otherwise, when they permit what Allah has forbidden, forbid what Allah has permitted, and spread corruption on earth through their words, actions, and support? Whoever defends them, or objects to declaring them disbelievers, or claims that their actions—if even false—do not take them out of Islam, is at the very least a sinner, because the religion of Islam cannot be established except by disavowal of these people and declaring them disbelievers."[9]

For this reason, all matters of governance, judiciary, economic systems, foreign relations, and internal affairs must be presented to Sharia. Nothing is excluded from it. Whoever claims that any of these matters are outside the authority of Sharia, and that the ruler has independent authority over

them, is a disbeliever outside the fold of Islam.

Fifth: Knowing the ruling of Allah regarding the system and governance is an obligation, due to the foundational matters of faith and monotheism (tawḥīd) that depend upon it. As for the practical rulings that follow from this, they relate to capability, preparation, fulfillment of conditions, and absence of obstacles. However, it remains obligatory to clarify all truths of Islam and all pillars of tawḥīd so that truth is distinguished from falsehood, and faith from disbelief, without confusion of concepts or opinions.

Clarification is a covenant from Allah upon us: “So that you make it clear to the people and do not conceal it.” (Āl ʿImrān 3:187). Any attempt to conceal religious truth under any pretext is rejected, including intellectual intimidation practiced by some scholars who claim that revealing the realities of governance leads to rebellion and chaos. This is rejected, because the greatest fitnah (trial) is concealing the truth and hiding it, not revealing it.

Sixth: Knowing the ruling of Allah regarding governance is tied to assessing whether the ruler fulfills the obligations that Allah has imposed upon him. Leadership (imāmah) in Islam was legislated to achieve necessary and essential Sharia objectives.

These obligations and objectives will be examined, and the system's performance will be evaluated in light of them, in order to determine its closeness or distance from them. Has the system truly fulfilled what Allah commanded, or has it instead abandoned those commands one by one and acted contrary to them while claiming protection and guardianship over them?

The objectives of Sharia cannot be fully achieved except through the implementation of its rulings. The foundation of these rulings is governance according to what Allah has revealed and rejecting what contradicts it. Then comes establishing enjoining good and forbidding evil, establishing justice in rulings and judiciary, maintaining the outward

rituals of Islam and protecting them, dealing with people according to Sharia-based rulings, safeguarding public wealth, spreading the message of Islam globally, and other matters mentioned in works of Islamic governance.

If the ruler neglects these duties or acts contrary to them, then the الأمة(community) must restrain him from wrongdoing through all legitimate means that remove falsehood and establish truth.

Seventh: Monitoring rulers and implementing the Sharia obligation of enjoining good and forbidding evil is a collective responsibility of the entire Muslim community. The Prophet slevel sti ot gnidrocca live egnahc ot dnammoc s'ﷺ—"Whoever among you

sees an
evil…”—is a general command for all members of the community who witness it.[i0]

This is a general expression because it appears in a conditional form without restriction. As for the Prophet’s ﷺ command regarding tyrannical rulers, it refers to not rebelling against them, not abandoning accountability, advising, or correcting them. This is part of properly applying all texts together without neglecting any of them, since there is no contradiction between them.

This applies to a sinful Muslim ruler. As for one who commits acts that nullify Islam, that is a separate matter which will be discussed in its proper place.

It is essential to keep these

foundational principles in mind when discussing the issue of legitimacy, because many who enter such sensitive discussions forget the established Sharia principles and instead rely on vague, non-authoritative assumptions. For example, although many claim adherence to the methodology of Ahl al-Sunnah wa'l-Jamāʿah, they may end up more extreme than rationalists in suspending textual evidence and relying on rational justification in defending rulers, more extreme than Shia in claiming infallibility for rulers, and more extreme than Sufis in absolute submission to rulers.

Therefore, it is necessary to define these foundational principles and return to them in cases of disagreement, otherwise the issue becomes lost and confused.

Footnotes to the Introduction

1. Ibn al-Qayyim, *Iʿlām al-Muwaqqiʿīn*, 1/87–88.
2. Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 28/544. Al-Shāṭibī also has a good discussion in this context; see *Al-Muwāfaqāt*, 4/165.
3. Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 28/233.
4. Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 28/233.
5. Muḥammad ibn Waddah, *al-Bidaʿ wa al-Nahy ʿAnha*, p. 59.
6. See Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 28/505.
7. See al-Māwardī, *al-Aḥkām al-Sulṭāniyyah*, pp. 55–56; and Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 28/349.
8. The hadith is narrated by Abū Dāwūd and al-Tirmidhī; and classified as ḥasan (good).

9. Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab, *al-Rasā'il al-Shakhṣiyyah*, p. 188.
10. The hadith is narrated by the five (except al-Bukhārī); see Muslim with al-Nawawī's commentary, 2/22.

“Judging by other than what Allah has revealed.”

Before discussing the evaluation of the Saudi system in terms of judging by Sharia (ḥukm bi-mā anzala Allāh), we first review some general principles related to this issue:

First:

The obligation to judge by what Allah has revealed is established in the Qur’an, the Sunnah, and consensus (ijmāʿ). Rather, it is known necessarily as part of the religion. Allah says:

“Indeed, We have revealed to you the Book in truth so that you may judge between people by what Allah has shown you…” (An-Nisāʾ 4:105)

Ibn Taymiyyah said:

“No one is permitted to judge between any of Allah’s creation except by the judgment of Allah and His Messenger… Whoever adopts anything other than that is included in Allah’s saying: ‘Is it the judgment of ignorance they seek? And who is better than Allah in judgment for a people who are certain?’ (Al-Māʾidah 5:50) and His saying: ‘But no, by your Lord, they will not believe until they make you judge in all disputes between them…’ (An-Nisāʾ 4:65).”[1]

And Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm said:
“Judging by the Sharia of Allah alone, without anything besides it, is parallel to worshipping Allah alone without associating partners with Him. This is because the meaning of the two testimonies is that Allah alone is the

only one worshipped, and that His Messenger is the only one followed and whose guidance is judged by… Jihad was legislated only for this purpose…”[2]

Second:

It is established in the Qur’an, Sunnah, and consensus that referring judgment to other than what Allah has revealed is referring to ṭāghūt (false authority). Enacting laws that contradict Allah’s judgment—whatever their name—is clear disbelief. Allah says:

“And whoever does not judge by what Allah has revealed, then they are the disbelievers.” (Al-Māʾidah 5:44)
Ibn Taymiyyah said:
“Whoever permits judging between people by what he sees as just without following what Allah has revealed is a disbeliever.”[3]

He also said:
“Whenever a person makes lawful what Allah has forbidden, or forbids what Allah has made lawful, or changes the Sharia, he becomes an apostate…”[4]

Ibn al-Qayyim said:
“Whoever refers judgment or arbitration to other than what the Messenger brought has indeed referred to ṭāghūt…”[5]

Shaykh ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Ḥasan said:
“Whoever calls for judging by other than Allah and His Messenger has abandoned what the Messenger brought…”[6]

Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm also said:
“Allah negated faith from those who seek judgment from ṭāghūt…”[7]

Third:

Commitment to Allah’s judgment requires that Sharia be supreme over all systems, laws, authorities, courts, institutions, rulers, judges, and officials. Any law that contradicts Sharia—even if minor—is considered judging by other than what Allah revealed, and carries the same legal description and consequences.

Al-Shāṭibī said:
“Every innovation—even if small—is an addition or reduction to the original Sharia… If someone intentionally does this within Sharia itself, it would be disbelief…”[8]

Al-Jaṣṣāṣ said:
“Whoever rejects anything from Allah’s commands or the commands of His Messenger has left Islam…”[9]

Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm said:
“Considering man-made laws for judgment, even in the smallest way, indicates rejection of Allah’s judgment…”[10]

Fourth:

The enactment of man-made laws, systems, and regulations, and the establishment of courts or bodies that

rule by them, is undoubtedly judging by other than what Allah has revealed, and it carries serious legal implications.

Allah says:

“Is it the judgment of ignorance they seek? And who is better than Allah in judgment for a people who are certain?” (Al-Māʾidah 5:50)
Ibn Kathīr said in his tafsīr of this verse: “Allah rebukes those who turn away from His perfectly just judgment, which includes all goodness and forbids all evil, and instead turn to other opinions, desires, and man-made conventions laid down without any basis in divine law. This is like the people of ignorance who ruled by misguidance and ignorance based on their own opinions and desires. It is also like the Tatars who ruled by political systems taken from

their king Genghis Khan, who had established the Yāsā law—a mixture of laws borrowed from Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and other sources, many of which were based purely on his own whims. They made it into a binding law and preferred it over the judgment of the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger ﷺ. Whoever does this is a disbeliever, and fighting him is obligatory until he returns to the judgment of Allah and His Messenger…"[11]

Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm said:
“One of the greatest forms of clear disbelief is the enactment of man-made law in place of the revealed Sharia…”[12]
Shaykh Muhammad al-Amīn al-Shinqīṭī said:
“Judging by systems that contradict the legislation of the Creator of the heavens and the earth in people’s lives, property, honor, and lineage is disbelief in the Creator…”[13]
Shaykh Muhammad Ḥāmid al-Fiqī said:
“Whoever legislates and enforces man-made laws is undoubtedly a disbeliever if he insists upon them and does not return to the judgment of Allah…”[14]

Shaykh Aḥmad Shākir said:
“This act is turning away from the judgment of Allah and preferring the laws of the disbelievers over it, and this is disbelief without doubt…”[15]

Fifth:

There is a major difference between a person who sometimes sins due to weakness, desire, ignorance, or injustice, and a system that enacts laws, establishes courts and institutions, and obligates people to follow man-made legislation as binding law.

The first category, although committing a major sin, may not reach disbelief that removes one from Islam. The second category, however, is clearly greater disbelief.

Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm said regarding the first category:
“As for disbelief that does not remove one from Islam—such as what Ibn ʿAbbās referred to as ‘disbelief less than disbelief’—it is like a person who follows his desire in a case and rules by

other than what Allah has revealed while still believing that Allah's judgment is the truth…"[16]

However, regarding the second category he said:
"This is clear opposition to Sharia, rivalry to Allah's rulings, imitation of Islamic courts, and complete structuring of man-made legal systems—based on imported laws such as French, American, British, and others… These courts are now fully established in many Muslim lands, ruling by laws that contradict the Book and Sunnah…"[17]

Sixth:

Merely claiming that a ruler or system "rules by Islam" is meaningless if it actually refers judgment to other than

the Sharia of Allah.

Allah says:

“Have you not seen those who claim to believe in what was revealed to you and what was revealed before you, yet wish to refer judgment to ṭāghūt…” (An-Nisāʾ 4:60)

Shaykh ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Ḥasan said:

“Whoever opposes the command of Allah and His Messenger and seeks judgment by other

than what Allah has revealed has removed himself from Islam, even if he claims to be a believer…”[18]

Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm said: “The term ‘they claim’ indicates the falsehood of their claim to faith, because referring judgment to other than what the Prophet ﷺ brought contradicts faith itself…”[19]

He also said explicitly: “If someone says: ‘I believe man-made law is false,’ yet still applies it, his claim is meaningless, just as someone who says: ‘I do not worship idols’ while actually worshipping them…”[20]

From this standpoint, the Saudi system can be evaluated: has it made Shariah the sovereign authority in systems and policies, and are its violations limited to some shortcomings, transgressions, and some injustices, whether due to

ignorance, favoritism, or desire, as happened with many Muslim caliphs in Islamic history? Or is the original basis of the current rule of the Al Saud the suspension of Sharia sovereignty, the application of man-made laws and systems, the restriction of Sharia courts to what is referred to them, and then granting judges and regional governors the right to suspend or annul rulings issued by those courts?

Reality:

The careful observer of the legislative reality and the conditions of laws and systems in the Kingdom cannot but reach a certain conclusion that the reality of the Kingdom fully and without dispute corresponds to the second case. However, the state avoids

the term “legislations and laws” and instead uses expressions such as systems, regulations, instructions, orders, and decrees, which in reality are complete legislations in the full sense of the word legislation, containing provisions of permission, prohibition, punishment, permissibility of the unlawful, and prohibition of the lawful. They claim that these are merely procedural systems with no knowledge of Sharia or law whatsoever.

Among these systems are: the Commercial Papers Law, the Companies Law, the Labor and Workers Law, the Banking Control Law, the Saudi Arabian Nationality Law, the Publications and Publishing Law, the Law of Press Institutions, the General Provisions of the Customs Tariff System, the Saudi Arabian

Armed Forces Law, the National Flag Law, and other laws and legislations.

The observer of these systems discovers that Islam is on one side and the rule of the Al Saud is on another side. The introduction of every system, regulation, or decree confirms that its sources of legislation are Western or mixed, and Sharia may be among them but is not the sole source. In some cases, Sharia is even described as a secondary or backup source of legislation, as in the system of the Board for Settlement of Gulf Cooperation Council Disputes and Article (185) of the Labor Law.

These systems have stipulated all forms of legislation contrary to Islam. As for the boundaries and Sharia punishments, the Saudi Armed Forces Law, the

Commercial Papers Law, the Anti-Corruption Law, and many others contain a large number of punishments that have no connection to Islam.

As for civil and commercial matters, such as the Commercial Papers Law and the Companies Law, they contain forms of dispute resolution and settlement mechanisms that contradict Sharia entirely. The Banking Control Law explicitly permits without reservation all usurious activities that are decisively prohibited by the Qur'an and Sunnah and considers them protected by the state. It even contains provisions contrary to Sharia in all respects.

It grants the king full and unrestricted authority. Article (27) of the Military Judiciary Law states: "The authority (the King) alone has the right to enforce, suspend, or replace judgments."

In order to implement these legislations

and so-called systems—deceptively and misleadingly called “regulations”—the state has formed non-Sharia courts, which it calls committees, bodies, bureaus, and councils. Membership in these courts requires mastery of those systems and laws, not Sharia. A researcher has found that there are more than thirty committees or bodies performing judicial functions contrary to Sharia, such as the Banking Disputes Committee, commercial courts, military judiciary bureaus, and many others.

As for Sharia courts, they are practically limited to narrow areas. Even then, they are not free from the dominance of man-made laws. Sharia judges are bound by instructions from the Council of Ministers, ministries, emirates, and municipalities, even if those instructions contradict Sharia.

Judicial rulings that contradict such instructions or the above-mentioned systems are not implemented. In fact, judges themselves cannot consider many cases except “according to the system,” and the system is what classifies cases in a way that restricts Sharia within narrow limits while giving man-made law wide authority.

Thus, this is the reality: sovereignty is not for Sharia, authority is not for Islam, and non-Islamic laws and legislations have been implemented in most state systems. Sharia judges are confined within narrow frameworks they cannot exceed. So how can anyone claim that this state applies Sharia or rules by Islam? And how can a seeker of truth doubt that referring to these legislations is referring to ṭāghūt?

What is certain here is that this opposition to Sharia is not merely deviation due to desire or injustice while still affirming Sharia authority; rather, it is rejection of Allah's law, establishment of other than it, and restriction of Allah's law. But can this be due to ignorance or negligence?

The answer is simple and brief: the proof has been clearly established against the rulers without doubt. Scholars such as Shaykh Ibn ʿAtīq, Shaykh Ibn Saʿdī, and the former mufti Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm (may Allah have mercy on them all) stood clearly against these legislations. Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm's correspondences rejecting and warning against these laws were documented one by one. Instead of responding, the Al Saud prevented the circulation of

these laws and systems and, by royal decree, printed and distributed the collected fatwas of Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm so that disbelief and hypocrisy would not become apparent.

Recently, scholars again offered advice in a systematic and focused manner in the "Advice Memorandum," in a way that leaves no excuse for ignorance or misunderstanding. However, they rejected the advice and insisted upon their laws and systems, so the proof has been clearly established against them without dispute.

So is there anyone of fairness and justice after this presentation who would still argue that the Saudi government rules by other than what Allah has revealed, and that this great obligation is تعطيل(suspended), and that the sin of this suspension falls upon the entire الأمة, because it is a collective obligation? The الأمةis therefore responsible to strive, within its capacity and ability, to establish this obligation so that it is not sinful and fulfills its duty to Allah.

Based on the above, those who defend the system under the claim that it implements Islam,
while at the same time falling into great danger, Allah says: “Indeed We have revealed to you the Book in truth so that you may judge between the people by what Allah has shown you, and do not be an advocate for the

treacherous…” (An-Nisāʾ 4:105–107).

Shaykh Muhammad ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb said in his explanation of Allah’s saying: “They took their scholars and monks as lords besides Allah” (At-Tawbah 9:31): “Whoever obeys scholars and rulers in making lawful what Allah has forbidden or forbidding what Allah has made lawful has taken them as lords…”[21]

Footnotes to judging by other than what Allah has revealed:

1. Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Fatāwā*, 35/407–408.
2. Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm, *al-Fatāwā*, 12/251.
3. Ibn Taymiyyah, *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah*, 3/12.
4. Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Fatāwā*, 3/267.
5. Ibn al-Qayyim, *I’lām al-Muwaqqiʿīn*, 1/49.

6. ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn Hasan Āl al-Shaykh, *Fatḥ al-Majīd*, p. 392.
7. Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm Āl al-Shaykh, "Risālat Taḥkīm al-Qawānīn", p. 8.
8. Imām al-Shāṭibī, *al-Iʿtisām*, 2/61.
9. al-Jaṣṣāṣ, *Aḥkām al-Qurʾān*, 2/214.
10. *Majmūʿ Fatāwā al-Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm*, vol. 12/251; "Risālat Taḥkīm al-Qawānīn", pp. 13, 41, 15.
11. See Ibn Kathīr, tafsīr Sūrat al-Mā idah, vol. 2/17.
12. Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm, "Risālat Taḥkīm al-Qawānīn", p. 5.
13. Muhammad al-Amīn al-Shinqīṭī, *Adwāʾ al-Bayān*, 4/84.
14. See *Fatḥ al-Majīd*, Sharḥ Kitāb al-Tawhīd, 3/396.
15. Ahmad Shākir, *ʿUmdat al-Tafsīr*, 4/157.
16. Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm, "Risālat Taḥkīm al-Qawānīn", p. 8.
17. Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm, "Risālat Taḥkīm al-Qawānīn", p. 7.
18. *Fatḥ al-Majīd*, Sharḥ Kitāb al-Tawhīd, p. 393.
19. See Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm, "Risālat Taḥkīm al-Qawānīn", pp. 8–9.
20. *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā* of Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm, 6/189.
21. Muhammad ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*, p. 146.

Al-Walāʾ and al-Barāʾ (loyalty and disavowal).

Loyalty to the believers and disavowal of the disbelievers is among the requirements of faith, and it is a correct criterion by which a believer is distinguished from a hypocrite. Before reviewing the foreign relations of the Saudi system, it is appropriate to present the Sharia principles on this serious topic.

First: It is established in the Qur'an, Sunnah, and consensus that the relations of Muslims with others must be based on Islam. Islam is the foundation of the relationship with others. The Qur'an has clarified the position of the Muslim toward the people of polytheism and disbelief.

Allah says:
“O you who believe, do not take the Jews and Christians as allies. They are allies of one another. And whoever among you takes them as allies is indeed one of them. Indeed, Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people.” (Al-Māʾidah 5:51)

And He says:
“The believers should not take the disbelievers as allies instead of the believers. Whoever does so has nothing to do with Allah, except when you fear from them a protective precaution. And Allah warns you of Himself, and to Allah is the final return.” (Āl ʿImrān 3:28)

And He says:
“You will not find a people who believe in Allah and the Last Day having

affection for those who oppose Allah and His Messenger…" (Al-Mujādilah 58:22)
And He says:
"The Jews and Christians will never be pleased with you until you follow their religion." (Al-Baqarah 2:120)
And He says:
"Have you not seen those who took a people with whom Allah is غضب(angry) as allies? They are neither of you nor of them…" (Al-Mujādilah 58:14)

And He says:
"Give glad tidings to the hypocrites that for them is a painful punishment—the ones who take disbelievers as allies instead of the believers…" (An-Nisāʾ 4:139)

Second: It is established in the Qur'an,

Sunnah, and consensus that forming alliances on a basis contrary to Islam leads to disbelief and خروجfrom the religion of Islam.

Ibn Jarīr said:

“Whoever takes the disbelievers as allies, supporters, and helpers against the Muslims has nothing to do with Allah; rather, he has disassociated from Allah, and Allah has disassociated from him due to his apostasy…”

And he also said that whoever takes Jews and Christians as allies instead of believers

becomes part of their religion, because whoever allies with someone does so out of acceptance of his religion and way.[1]

Ibn Hazm said:
"The meaning of His saying: 'Whoever among you takes them as allies is indeed one of them' is that he is a disbeliever among the disbelievers."[2]

Ibn Taymiyyah said:
"Allah has clarified in this verse that whoever takes them as allies is one of them…"[3]

Ibn al-Qayyim said:
“Allah has ruled—and none is better than His ruling—that whoever allies with Jews and Christians is from them…”[4]

Shaykh Sulaymān ibn ʿAbd Allāh Āl al-Shaykh said:
“Allah has clarified that whoever allies with them is from them…”[5]

Shaykh ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAtīq said:
“The Qur’an and Sunnah indicate that if a Muslim shows loyalty to the people of polytheism and submits to them, he thereby apostatizes

from his religion…”[6]

Shaykh ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Laṭīf said:
“Whoever submits to the disbelievers, obeys them, or shows loyalty to them has fought Allah and His Messenger and has apostatized…”[7]

Third: Among the obligations of a Muslim state based on this is that it must strive to spread Islam, support daʿwah everywhere, support Muslims and their causes, and defend them. Allah says:

“And what is wrong with you that you do not fight in the cause of Allah and for the oppressed among men, women, and children…” (An-Nisāʾ 4:75)

It is authentically reported from the Prophet ﷺ that he said:
“I have been commanded to fight people until they testify that there is no god but Allah and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah…”[8]
And he said:
“Whoever humiliates a believing person while he is

able to support him, Allah will humiliate him before the witnesses on the Day of Judgment."[9]

And he said:

"No Muslim man who abandons another Muslim in a place where his honor is violated except that Allah will abandon him in a place where he desires help."[10]

Fourth: The scholars of Islam have unanimously agreed that any state, group, or individual that supports the enemies of Islam against Muslims—

whether by money, manpower, weapons, intelligence, or information—is outside the fold of Islam.

Shaykh ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Ḥasan Āl al-Shaykh said: "If he goes out with them to fight the Muslims willingly, assisting them with his body and wealth, then there is no doubt that his ruling is their ruling in disbelief."[11]

Friendship (al-walā') is for the believer, and enmity/allegiance (al-walā') with the disbelievers is among the requirements of faith, and a correct criterion by which the believer is distinguished from the hypocrite. Before reviewing the foreign relations of the Saudi regime, it is appropriate to present the legal facts in this dangerous topic.

First: It is established in the Qur'an, Sunnah, and

consensus that relations of Muslims with others must be built on the basis of Islam. Islam is the origin in the relationship with others. Allah said: “O you who believe, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies; they are allies of one another. And whoever among you takes them as allies, then he is indeed one of them. Indeed Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people.” (Al-Ma’idah 51). And He the Exalted said: “The believers do not take the disbelievers as

allies instead of the believers; and whoever does that has nothing with Allah, except that you guard yourselves from them
cautiously. And Allah warns you of Himself, and to Allah is the final return." (Aal 'Imran 28). And He said: "You will not find a people who believe in Allah and the Last Day having affection for those who oppose Allah and His Messenger." (Al-Mujadilah 22). And He also said: "And the Jews and the Christians will never be

pleased with you until you follow their religion." (Al-Baqarah 120). And likewise He said: "Have you not seen those who took a people upon whom is the wrath of Allah as allies? They are neither of you nor of them…" (Al-Mujadilah 14). And He the Exalted said: "Give glad tidings to the hypocrites that for them is a painful punishment. Those who take the disbelievers as allies instead of the believers…" (An-Nisa 139).

Second: It is established in the

Qur'an, Sunnah, and consensus that establishing relations upon a basis contrary to Islam leads to disbelief and exit from the religion of Islam. Ibn Jarir said: whoever takes the disbelievers as supporters, helpers, and allies against the Muslims is not from Allah, meaning Allah has disassociated from him and he has disassociated from Allah by apostasy… Then he said: whoever takes Jews and Christians as allies instead of believers is from them, meaning from their religion

and creed… Ibn Hazm said: the meaning of His saying: “and whoever among you takes them as allies is indeed one of them” is upon its ظاهر(apparent meaning), that he is a disbeliever among the disbelievers… Ibn Taymiyyah said: Allah informed in this verse that their ally is from them… Ibn al-Qayyim said: Allah has ruled that whoever takes Jews and Christians as allies is from them… and so on.

Third: It is among the duties

of the Muslim state, based on that, to strive to spread Islam, support da‘wah everywhere, support Muslims, their issues, and defend them. Allah said: “And what is [the matter] with you that you do not fight in the cause of Allah and for the oppressed among men, women, and children…” (An-Nisa 75). And it is authentically reported from the Prophet ﷺ: “I have been commanded to fight the people until they testify that there is no god but Allah and that Muhammad is the

Messenger of Allah…" And from Sahl ibn Hunayf: "Whoever humiliates a Muslim in a place where he is humiliated while he is able to support him, Allah will humiliate him…" And from Jabir: "There is no man who abandons a Muslim in a situation where his honor is violated except that Allah will abandon him…"

Fourth: The scholars of the Muslims have agreed that any state, group, or individual who supports the enemies of Islam

against Muslims with money, men, weapons, or espionage and information is an apostate from the religion. Hamad ibn ‘Atiq said: whoever goes out with them to fight the Muslims willingly and assisting them in body and wealth, there is no doubt that his ruling is their ruling in disbelief…

Reality:

The attentive observer of the legislative reality and the condition of laws and systems in the Kingdom cannot but reach a certain conclusion that the reality of the Kingdom applies fully and without dispute to the second case. But the state avoids the word “legislation and laws” and uses instead the terms “systems, regulations, instructions, orders, and decrees,” which in reality are complete legislations in the full meaning

of legislation. In them are provisions of permission, prohibition, punishments, and making lawful the forbidden and forbidding the lawful, while they claim they are merely procedural systems.

From these systems: the commercial papers system, companies system, labor system, banking supervision system, nationality system, press and publication system, press institutions system, customs tariff system, Saudi Arabian army system, national

flag system, and others.

Examining these systems shows that Islam is on one side and the rule of Al Saud is on another side. The introduction of each system confirms that its sources are Western or mixed sources, and even if Sharia is mentioned, it is not the sole source but only one among others, and sometimes it is even treated as a secondary source.

Sharia is also bypassed in criminal laws, banking laws, and commercial matters, where

there are many rulings unrelated to Islam, while interest-based banking activities are legalized and protected.

The judiciary is restricted, and judges are bound by executive instructions even if they contradict Sharia rulings, and judgments contrary to regulations are not executed.

Thus, sovereignty is not for Sharia, and the systems are not Islamic law, and non-Islamic legislation is widely applied, while Sharia courts are

confined within narrow limits.

Therefore, how can it be

claimed that this system

applies Sharia or rules by

Islam? And is it considered

legitimate after all this?

The Saudi system’s relations with America, hostile regimes, socialist states, normalization with Israel, and interference in Islamic movements are then

listed as examples of foreign policy dependency and alliance with non-Muslim powers, followed by the conclusion questioning legitimacy.

Footnotes of al-walā’ and al-barā’

1. Al-Qurtubi, Al-Jami’ li-Ahkam al-Qur’an vol. 6/313
2. Ibn Hazm, Al-Muhalla vol. 13/35
3. Ibn Taymiyyah, Al-Iman, 14
4. Ibn al-Qayyim, Ahkam Ahl al-Dhimmah vol. 1/67-69
5. Sulayman Ibn Abdullah Al al-Sheikh, Awthaq ‘Ura al-Iman, 26-27
6. See al-Rasa’il wa al-Masa’il al-Najdiyyah vol.

1 p. 745, and also Majmu' Rasa'il Hamad ibn 'Atiq (100-101)

7. Abdullah ibn Abd al-Latif, al-Durar al-Saniyyah vol. 7 p. 11
8. Reported by Muslim
9. Reported by Ahmad with a good chain

10. Al-Haythami said its chain is good
11. See al-Rasa'il wa al-Masa'il al-Najdiyyah vol. 2/134-135
12. Previous reference vol. 3/52
13. See Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab, Mukhtasar al-Tawhid, 29, and previous reference
14. See Nasihat Ahl al-Islam, 179

Raising the Sha'ir (symbols) of Islam

From the established principles is that Muslims, individuals, groups, and the state must strive to strengthen Islam and raise the sha‘a’ir (symbols) of Islam, but before evaluating the system in this aspect, it is necessary to present the general legal grounding on this issue.

First: It is established in the Qur’an and Sunnah that tamkeen (empowerment) of Islam, raising the word of Allah, establishing the symbols of Islam and manifesting them is a legal obligation upon whoever is given authority over Muslims. Allah says: “Those who, if We give them authority in the land, establish prayer, give zakah, enjoin good and forbid evil” (Al-Hajj 41). Al-Qurtubi quoted from Al-Dahhak in the interpretation of this verse: (... it is a condition which Allah, the Exalted, has placed upon whoever is granted

authority ...)(1).
Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab said: (... the purpose of all leadership is that the religion be entirely for Allah, for He created creation for that purpose, and that is goodness, guidance and taqwa ...)(2). Ibn Taymiyyah said: (it must be known that leadership over people is among the greatest obligations of religion; rather there is no establishment of religion except through it)(3). Imam al-Juwayni said (al-gharad min al-imama): (establishing the foundations of Islam willingly or unwillingly, and the purpose is religion)(4). Al-Mawardi said: (... leadership is established as a succession of prophethood in guarding religion and managing worldly affairs)(5). Thus, the first objective for which leadership was legislated is to establish religion at the level of society and the state.

Second: It is established in the Qur'an and Sunnah that raising the symbols of Islam and enabling the religion of Allah is not achieved except through the leadership performing enjoining good (all good) and forbidding evil (all evil). Therefore, enjoining good and forbidding evil in its comprehensive meaning is an obligation upon the wali al-amr. If it is neglected, a great symbol of Islam is neglected, and if it is violated, the purpose of leadership in Islam is violated. Allah says: "You are the best nation brought forth for mankind, enjoining good and forbidding evil" (Aal Imran 110). And He says: "Those who, if We give them authority in the land, establish prayer, give zakah, enjoin good and forbid evil" (Al-Hajj 41). And He says: "The believing men and believing women are allies of one another; they enjoin good

and forbid evil" (At-Tawbah 71). The imam is a representative or deputy of the ummah in fulfilling the covenant of the believers with Allah regarding enjoining good and forbidding evil. Ibn Taymiyyah stated clearly: (... all Islamic leadership is intended for enjoining good and forbidding evil ...)(6). Ibn al-Qayyim also transmitted the statement of Ibn Taymiyyah: (... all Islamic leadership is intended for enjoining good and forbidding evil ...)(7). Abd al-Rahman ibn Hasan Al al-Sheikh said: (... it is upon the wali al-amr to monitor people so they do not fall into what Allah and His Messenger have prohibited, such as immoral acts, and to remove their causes ...)(8). Ibn Taymiyyah said regarding enjoining good and forbidding evil: (... this is obligatory upon every capable Muslim, and it is a collective obligation,

becoming individual upon the capable one when others do not fulfill it; and ability means authority and leadership ...)(9).

Third: It is also established in the Qur'an and Sunnah that neglecting these symbols, spreading falsehood, and weakening truth is a cause of destruction and punishment in this world, in addition to sin. Allah says: "And when We intend to destroy a town, We command its affluent ones, but they commit fisq therein, so the word is justified upon it, and We destroy it completely" (Al-Isra 16). Al-Qurtubi said in its interpretation: (... meaning We make its leaders and affluent people fall into corruption and wrongdoing, so the decree of destruction becomes justified upon them ...)(10).

And the prophetic ahadith in this meaning are numerous. Among them is what al-Tirmidhi and Abu Dawud narrated from Abdullah ibn Mas‘ud who said: The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: “When moral decline occurred among the Children of Israel, a man among them would see his brother committing sin, so he would forbid him from it, but when the next day came, it did not prevent him from eating with him, drinking with him, and mixing with him. So Allah struck the hearts of some of them with others, and He revealed in the Qur’an, and He said: ‘Cursed were those who disbelieved among the Children of Israel by the tongue of Dawud and Isa ibn Maryam, that was because they disobeyed and used to transgress’ (al-Ma’idah 78) and he recited until He reached: ‘And if they had believed in Allah and the

Prophet and what was revealed to him, they would not have taken them as allies, but many of them are defiantly disobedient' (al-Ma'idah 78–81)(11).

And from Qays ibn Abi Hazim who said: Abu Bakr stood after praising Allah and thanking Him and said: O people, you recite this verse and place it in other than its place: "O you who believe, upon you is yourselves, those who go astray will not harm you if you are guided" (al-Ma'idah 105). We heard the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, say: "If people see an oppressor and do not take him by his hand, Allah is about to punish them all." And I heard the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, say: "There is no people among whom sins are committed and they are able to change it but do not change it except that Allah is about to

punish them all”(12).

And from Jarir ibn Abdullah al-Bajali who said: I heard the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, say: “There is no man among a people among whom sins are committed, and they are able to change it but do not change it, except that Allah afflicts them with punishment before they die”(13).

And from Hudhayfah ibn al-Yaman from the Prophet, peace be upon him, who said: “By the One in Whose hand is my soul, you must enjoin good and forbid evil, or Allah will soon send upon you a punishment from Him, then you will call upon Him and He will not respond to you”(14).

These evidences and others are clear proof that the negligence of the ummah, represented by its deputies and at their head the ruler, in enjoining good and

forbidding evil is a direct cause for worldly punishment, in addition to sin and bad deeds. So how if the situation is more than mere negligence, but rather commanding evil, forbidding good, spreading immorality,
defending falsehood, and fighting da‘wah.

Fourth: The scholars stated that a group that refrains and persists in suspending established Shari‘ah rulings, or making lawful what is clearly forbidden with no excuse, is treated like those who withhold zakah, whom Abu Bakr fought. This is not because they denied prophethood or the Qur’an or even because they left prayer, but because they rejected those established symbols. Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said: (... any group that refrains while ascribing itself to Islam

and refuses some of its apparent and mutawatir laws, it is obligatory to fight it by agreement of the Muslims until the religion is entirely for Allah)(15).

And he said in another place: (... any group that refrains from some obligatory prayers or fasting or Hajj, or from committing to the prohibition of blood, wealth, alcohol and gambling, or from marrying mahram women, or from jihad against disbelievers, or paying jizyah, or other obligations of religion and prohibitions which no one is excused for denying, then such a group is fought even if they acknowledge them)(16).

And reflect on his saying: “even if they acknowledge them,” meaning mere acknowledgment is not enough, rather implementation is required.

After this presentation of what Islam requires from the state in establishing symbols, enabling religion, enjoining good and forbidding evil, and the danger of abandoning that upon society, how was the performance of the Saudi system in this aspect? And how can it be evaluated from this perspective? And those who are keen to reach the truth in their belief and action should reflect carefully and abandon simplification and emotional judgment and accept the realities of matters.

Reality:

When looking at the Saudi system today in this way, the observer reaches a strange conclusion: that this system did not merely fall short in this obligation for which leadership in Islam was legislated, but rather it contradicted it

and worked against it. It has become clear that the system's dealing with establishing religion on the earth, manifesting symbols, da'wah to Allah, and enjoining good and forbidding evil is a complete plan and opposing strategy, whose result is dissolving this society, cutting the ummah from its religious heritage, and turning Muslims into individuals whose religion is between them and their Lord, and separating the social and state dimension from Islam at least in practice.

First model: the jihad symbol, even its minimum level, which is considered its basic form, is completely suspended, which is protecting the community and strengthening borders so that Muslims are safe in their religion, lives, wealth, and honor. Al-Mawardi said in listing the responsibilities of the Imam: (... the third: protecting the community and defending the sacred places so that people may move in livelihood and travel safely from fear of harm to life or wealth ...)(17). And Imam al-Haramayn said: (... as for the imam's attention to securing borders, it is among the most important matters ...)(18). It is known by necessity in religion that jihad is obligatory and that its minimum level includes protection of borders and fortification, and it is clear that deliberate weakening of the army, exposing the country to enemies, total

reliance on enemies for protection, and bringing in their forces and enabling them within Muslim borders, and even making dependence on them and acknowledging that publicly, and making treaties for that purpose, is a clear suspension and complete negation of this great symbol. When this became apparent in the Gulf War, some thought the situation would improve, but what happened was confirmation of this reality through the continued presence of Jewish and Christian armies in Muslim lands and signing more agreements, which led to occupation of parts of the Muslim world, and there is no comment here other than that this situation falls under Ibn Taymiyyah's description of refraining groups.

Second model: among the clearly suspended symbols is the prohibition of riba, which is

firmly established in the Qur'an and Sunnah and is known necessarily in religion. The Qur'an has explicitly stated its prohibition.

That it is war against Allah and His Messenger. Allah تعالى said:
"O you who believe, fear Allah and give up what remains of riba if you are believers. And if you do not do so, then be informed of war from Allah and His Messenger. But if you repent, then you shall have your capital sums, you do not wrong and you are not wronged" (Al-Baqarah 279).

It has been established in the hadith that the prohibition of riba is greater than the prohibition of what people consider grave, which is zina. And despite all that prohibition, and although it is war

against Allah and His Messenger, the rulers did not stop at merely allowing riba openly—which in itself is a major crime—but they made it the basis of economic dealings inside and outside the country, and they legally and systemically supported all interest-based institutions. Rather, they even supported them financially, as the state on more than one occasion saved banks when they were about to collapse.

And the state did not stop at that, but it officially prevented the establishment of Islamic banks, and prevented the publication of scholars' fatwas regarding interest-based banks, and prevented hadiths and advertisements that support Islamic banking, even those existing in non-Muslim countries. So does anyone still doubt that the شعيرة(religious

symbol/principle) of the prohibition of riba is تعطيل (disabled) in the land of the Haramain?

We return and mention the words of Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah about the rebellious groups, and that mere acknowledgment of obligation or prohibition does not prevent the application of the ruling upon them when the شعيرةis تعطيلand what results from it in Islamic law (19).

The third model of the تعطيلor violation of شعائرis the شعيرةof enjoining good and forbidding evil. The intended شرعيmeaning is not what is called in some countries “enjoining good and forbidding evil departments”, but rather the establishment of the state through its authority to spread da‘wah, command good, protect it, and prevent evil at all levels, as mentioned by Ibn Taymiyyah (20).

And it may become clear to the seeker of truth that the state did not merely fall short in this شعيرة, but rather acted against it by ordering evil, forbidding good, and fighting da‘wah. If one examines the state’s method of dealing with da‘wah, one finds it to be a complete program similar to “drying up the sources” policies implemented in some North African countries.

Through this program, the state worked to block all channels through which the word of truth and good could reach the people, and to facilitate all channels through which falsehood and evil could reach them.

In the first aspect, the state restricted preachers, making speaking to people—whether in mosques or public gatherings—prohibited except with permission, and used this system to prevent many sincere callers. In the same direction, the state dismissed many imams, scholars, and preachers from mosques and even universities, despite some of them not exceeding religious exhortation.

Then the state completed this step by arresting a large number of scholars and preachers and hundreds of their

followers, and keeping them behind bars, and in some cases subjecting them to punishment, depriving the الأمةof even seeing or meeting them.

As for preachers outside the country, Saudi Arabia used to be a refuge for those fleeing oppression, but now obtaining a visa may be prevented due to Islamic or political activity. Worse than that, it has become a practice to hand over those who seek refuge in the country to their governments for killing and torture.

As for the media aspect, the state imposed a strict blockade on Islamic tapes, closed many Islamic recording shops, banned many recordings, and imposed strict penalties for violations. It also almost completely banned Islamic gatherings and prevented Muslims from speaking to the public through visual,

audio, and print media, except within limited individual acts of worship.

Islamists were also prevented from reaching any sensitive political, military, security, or educational positions. The state even interfered in appointing university staff and department heads in order to prevent the spread of Islamic benefit and da‘wah.

In the same objective of restricting da‘wah, the state recently implemented a policy of stopping all financial activities, even charitable ones, closing all charitable institutions, and strongly preventing any form of cooperation in righteousness and piety, dealing with it harshly.

Anyone who examines the details of this implementation concludes that the purpose is Islam itself, not merely the

opposition of a shaykh or scholar who criticizes the rulers. This is illustrated by the so-called “Death Street” incident, which reflects the concept of the state’s war against Islam itself, not just critics.

Years ago, a group of preachers noticed gatherings of deviant youth in the outskirts of Riyadh engaging in immoral acts such as drug use and sodomy. The preachers tried to establish a nearby camp, inviting them with kindness and encouragement. Thousands of those youths were attracted and began to turn into righteous young men.

However, before the idea succeeded, security forces raided the camp, destroyed it, and expelled everyone on the claim that there was no permission. The preachers tried again and obtained permission from Shaykh Ibn Baz, but shortly after, security forces again destroyed the camp and arrested the person who had obtained the permission, and he was only released after pledging not to repeat the act.

So is this not evidence of a war against da‘wah itself and a deliberate effort to spread falsehood in all its forms?

And in response to the blockade of da‘wah, the state worked intensely to destroy society through all means of destruction. In the media, there was intellectual destruction and moral destruction, and in order to promote vice and moral and intellectual deviation through official media, the state exported its media abroad to spread poison from there.

In the field of allowing enemies of Islam and those with deviant thought and conduct, these people have taken control of most positions and sensitive places in the country. It has even become a requirement for employment in sensitive positions to prove lack of

religious commitment, where religious commitment has become a disqualifying trait for those who assume such responsibilities.

At a time when reformers were prevented from addressing the nation, the door was opened wide for corrupters in the media. While Islamic channels were blocked, immoral and corrupt magazines were allowed to circulate in the country and corrupt it. The same applied to Islamic recordings and video shops. The state even supported, through influential princes and their entourage, all forms of corruption such as prostitution, drugs, alcohol, sodomy, moral breakdown, and deviation, and protected their owners from any form of punishment. What is seen in this field is shocking, and it is imagined that thousands of

princes—each prince—can import, distribute, sell, and protect whoever they want. How then can a country survive destruction without being struck at its core?

In addition to the above, the state sought a radical solution to these issues by changing educational curricula so that students would be detached from their connection to creed and religion, and no longer distinguish between Islam and disbelief, or between Sunnah and innovation, turning them into an environment seeking gratification of desires.

One remaining matter is what is called the “enjoining good and forbidding evil departments.” The reality of these departments is that they are a burden the regime became entangled with in its

legacy, and it could not get rid of them for fear of reaction from scholars. So it worked to make them perform the opposite of their intended role, which is distorting Islam and alienating people from it. After a number of measures, they were turned into a powerless institution whose influence does not even equal that of small police stations, and they were deprived of all forms of development and organization, and a number of trained intelligence personnel were imposed within them to distort the image of Islam.

Without the great efforts of some sincere individuals inside this apparatus, the impact of this project in distorting the image of Islam through this institution would have been much greater than what exists now.

Thus, this is the reality of the system: an integrated program waging war on Islam in the mosque, market, school, television, entertainment, newspaper, and at the level of the individual, society, and state—a program aimed at erasing the الأمةfrom its religion and civilization. So can anyone prove that the system defends Islam and da‘wah and supports them? That is impossible. Rather, even to claim that its situation with da‘wah is merely negligence or incapacity is itself impossible.

After all this, the evidence has been

established that an undeclared war is being waged
against Islam, da‘wah, and the callers in the land of the Haramain. So how can legitimacy remain for one who has violated major شعائرsuch as jihad, protection of the frontiers, and who has fought da‘wah while protecting riba and corruption?

Footnotes of raising the Sha’ir of Islam

1. al-Qurtubi, al-Jami‘ li Ahkam al-Qur’an, 7/73
2. Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab, al-Majmu‘ al-Kamil, 9/42
3. Ibn Taymiyyah, al-Siyasah al-Shar‘iyyah, 139
4. al-Juwayni, Ghayath al-Umam, 138
5. al-Mawardi, al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyyah, 5
6. Ibn Taymiyyah, al-Hisbah, 6
7. Ibn al-Qayyim, al-Turuq al-Hukmiyyah fi al-Siyasah al-Shar‘iyyah, 246
8. See al-Rasa’il wa al-Masa’il al-Najdiyyah, 2/11
9. Ibn Taymiyyah, al-Hisbah, 6
10. al-Qurtubi, al-Jami‘ li Ahkam al-Qur’an, 1/230
11. Narrated by Abu Dawud and al-Tirmidhi
12. Reported by Abu Dawud and al-Tirmidhi

13. Narrated by Abu Dawud
14. Narrated by al-Tirmidhi and Muslim in the Book of Leadership and the obligation of obeying the ruler
15. Ibn Taymiyyah, al-Siyasah al-Shar'iyyah, 108
16. Ibn Taymiyyah, al-Fatawa, 28/503
17. al-Mawardi, al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyyah, 16
18. al-Juwayni, Ghayath al-Umam, 156
19. See Ibn Taymiyyah, al-Fatawa, 28/503

The duties towards the subjects (al-raʻiyyah)

Scholars have clarified, through their understanding of the legal texts and from the practice of the Messenger ﷺ and the Rightly Guided Caliphs, that the imam has specific legal duties toward his subjects. The most prominent of

these duties are the establishment of justice, the protection of public wealth, its collection and expenditure through lawful means, and appointing those who possess strength and trustworthiness to positions and responsibilities.

In addition, it is the ruler's responsibility to facilitate the means of livelihood. These duties are binding legal obligations, not a favor granted by the ruler to his people; carrying them out and being diligent in them is the fulfillment of a duty, not a benevolence toward anyone. The reality of his role in this matter is that he bears the greatest responsibility and the heaviest burden. In the hadith, the Prophet ﷺ said: "All of you are shepherds and all of you are responsible for your flock,"

and among them he mentioned: “The leader who is over the people is a shepherd and is responsible for his subjects”(1). And from Ma‘qil ibn Yasar, the Prophet ﷺ said: “There is no servant whom Allah entrusts with the care of subjects among the Muslims, and he dies while deceiving them, except that Allah forbids Paradise for him”(2).

And he ﷺ said: “There is no servant who is given authority over the Muslims, then does not

strive for them and advise them sincerely, except that he will not enter Paradise with them”(3). And from ‘A’idh ibn ‘Amr, addressing ‘Ubayd Allah ibn Ziyad, he said: O my son, I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ say: “The worst of shepherds are the unjust ones, so beware of being among them”(4). And from ‘A’ishah, who said: I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ say in this regard: “O Allah, whoever is given authority over any affair of my community and is harsh with them, be harsh with him; and whoever is given authority over any affair of my community and is gentle with them, be gentle with him”(5). Thus, the matter is one of obligation and duty, not favor or benevolence, and these duties are many, among the most important of them are:

The first duty: Establishing justice.
Allah تعالىsaid: “Indeed, Allah commands justice, excellence, and giving to relatives…” (An-Nahl, 90), and He said: “Indeed, Allah commands you to render trusts to whom they are due and when you judge between people to judge with justice…” (An-Nisa, 58). The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: “Seven will be shaded by Allah in His shade on the Day when there is no shade except His…,” and among them he mentioned: “a just leader”(6). He ﷺ also said: “There is no ruler over a people, whether few or many, who does not deal justly among them except that Allah will cast him on his face into the Fire”(7). And the Prophet ﷺ said: “There is no leader of a group except that he will be brought on the Day of Resurrection bound, and nothing will

release him except justice or destroy him will be injustice”(8).

Regarding the condemnation of oppression, Allah تعالىsaid: “And when Abraham was tested by his Lord with commands and he fulfilled them, He said: Indeed, I will make you a leader for the people. He said: And from my offspring? He said: My covenant does not include the wrongdoers” (Al-Baqarah, 124). Ibn Abbas الله عنه رضيsaid in its interpretation: “There is no covenant for a wrongdoer, and you must not obey him in wrongdoing,” and he said: “The wrongdoer has no covenant; even if you make one with him, break it”(9). Al-Jassas said in his interpretation: “It is not permissible for a wrongdoer to be a prophet, nor a successor to a prophet, nor a judge, nor should his testimony be accepted in

religious matters”(10). He also said: “This proves the invalidity of the leadership of a sinful person, and that he cannot be a ruler, and whoever assumes this position while being sinful is not to be followed or obeyed”(11). Al-Qurtubi said: “The wrongdoer is not fit to be a leader, nor a ruler, nor a mufti, nor a witness, nor a narrator”(12).

Allah تعالىalso said: “Indeed, the wrongdoers will have a painful punishment in this world and the Hereafter” (Ash-Shura). In the Hadith Qudsi: “O My servants, I have forbidden oppression for Myself and made it forbidden among you, so do not oppress one another”(13). And the Prophet ﷺ said: “Beware of oppression, for oppression will be darkness on the Day of Resurrection”(14). And he ﷺ

said: “Two types from my الأمةwill not receive my intercession: a tyrannical, oppressive leader and every excessive deviant”(15).

Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said: “Judging with justice is obligatory at all times and places upon everyone; and ruling by what Allah revealed to Muhammad ﷺ is perfect justice, the most complete and best form of justice. It is obligatory upon the Prophet ﷺ and all who follow him, and whoever does not adhere to the حكمof Allah and His Messenger is a disbeliever”(16). He also said: “If the texts have made it obligatory to render trusts to their people and to judge with justice, then these two comprise the foundation of just and sound governance”(17). Ibn al-Qayyim said: “The Sharia is founded upon justice,

mercy, wisdom, and the welfare of people in this world and the Hereafter. Every matter that departs from

justice to injustice, from mercy to its opposite, from benefit to harm, and from wisdom to corruption is not from the Sharia, even if it is introduced through interpretation”(18).

The disappearance of justice and spread of oppression not only indicate the injustice of the ruler and his مخالفةto the Sharia, but also lead to the ruin of lands and the descent of punishment. Allah تعالىsaid: “And thus is the seizure of your Lord when He seizes the towns while they are wrongdoers; indeed, His seizure is painful and severe” (Hud, 102). Ibn Taymiyyah said: “It is said that Allah supports the just state even if it is disbelieving, and does not support the oppressive state even if it is believing”(19). He also said: “Justice is the system of everything; if the affairs of the world are established with

justice, they endure—even if their صاحبhas no share in the Hereafter; and if they are not established with justice, they do not endure, even if their صاحبhas faith that will benefit him in the Hereafter”(20).

The second duty: Preserving public wealth, collecting it, and spending it in a lawful manner. The Sharia has defined specific methods that must not be exceeded in collecting public wealth. The imam is obligated to safeguard it, protect it, and spend it in legitimate avenues. Severe warnings have been reported against those who neglect this. The Prophet ﷺ said: “Indeed, men who wrongfully consume the wealth of Allah will have the Fire on the Day of Resurrection”(21). Ibn Hajar said: “In this hadith is a deterrent for governors from taking anything

from wealth without right or withholding it from its rightful people”(22).
Abu Ya‘la said regarding collection: “Collection of fay’ and charities must be according to what the Sharia has obligated, without injustice.” And regarding spending: “Allocating from Bayt al-Mal without extravagance or deficiency, and giving it at its proper time without
delay”(23).

It is reported that Umar likened the role of the ruler regarding wealth to that of a guardian over an orphan’s wealth: “I consider myself regarding the wealth of Allah like a guardian of an orphan—if I am self-sufficient, I refrain; if I am in need, I take reasonably”(24). Many texts prohibit misappropriation and warn against it. Among the most

explicit is what Abu Dawud narrated from al-Mustawrid ibn Shaddad that the Prophet ﷺ said: “Whoever is appointed as a worker for us should take a wife; if he does not have a servant, let him take one; if he does not have a house, let him take one.” Abu Bakr said: The Prophet ﷺ said: “Whoever takes beyond that is a betrayer or a thief”(25). And the Muslim scholars have elaborated in precise detail on matters of wealth through their understanding of the Qur’an, the Sunnah, and the practice of the Prophet ﷺ and the Rightly Guided Caliphs. Al-Mawardi said, in listing the duties of the imam: “…to assess what is due from wealth related to religious obligations without distortion in its collection and to distribute it accordingly…”(26). Ibn Taymiyyah الله رحمهsaid, in classifying types of revenue

collection: "…there is a type that the imam is entitled to collect based on the Qur'an, Sunnah, and consensus, as mentioned; a type that is forbidden to take by consensus, such as levies taken from the people of a town for the public treasury due to a killing that occurred among them when the killer has an heir, or in place of a prescribed punishment which would then be waived, and like unjust taxes that are not permissible to impose by agreement; and a type subject to ijtihad and اختلاف, such as wealth related to a relative who is neither a fixed heir nor an عصبة, and similar cases…"(27).

The third duty: Appointing competent individuals who possess strength and trustworthiness to positions of state authority. Allah تعالىsaid: "Indeed, the best one you can

hire is the strong and the trustworthy” (Al-Qasas, 26). Ibn Taymiyyah الله رحمهsaid in its interpretation: “These two conditions—strength and trustworthiness—refer to knowledge and

expertise in the task assigned, the ability to carry it out, and fear of Allah rather than of people…”(28).

It has been reported from the Prophet ﷺ that he said: “Whoever is given authority over any affair of the Muslims and appoints a man while there is someone more suitable than him among them has betrayed Allah and His Messenger.” In another narration: “Whoever appoints a man over a group while there is someone more pleasing (more suitable) among them has betrayed Allah, His Messenger, and the believers”(29). Umar ibn al-Khattab said: “Whoever is given authority over the affairs of the Muslims and appoints a man out of affection or kinship has betrayed Allah, His Messenger, and the Muslims,” and he also said: “Whoever appoints a

wicked person while knowing he is wicked is like him”(30).

In Sahih al-Bukhari, from Abu Hurayrah, the Prophet ﷺ said regarding the loss of trust: “When authority is given to those who are not qualified, then await the Hour”(31). Al-Mawardi said in listing the duties of the imam: “The seventh is selecting his deputies in affairs such that they are from among those who are competent and trustworthy in them…”(32).

Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah الله رحمهsaid: “…It is obligatory upon the ruler to appoint for every task among the affairs of the Muslims the most suitable person available for that task. This is a duty upon him; he must search for those who are deserving of positions

among his deputies over regions, among the commanders who act as representatives of authority, the judges, and the military leaders. Each of these must also appoint the most suitable person available. Thus, whoever is given any authority over the affairs of the Muslims must appoint in every position under his control the most suitable person he can find, and a person should not be advanced merely because he sought the position or preceded others in requesting it, as that is a cause for disqualification…”(33).

In addition to the obligation of selecting people of trust and strength, the Sharia has also made it obligatory to hold officials accountable and to discipline or punish them when necessary. This is established in the authentic hadith of Ibn al-Lutbiyyah,

whom the Prophet atnuocca dleh ﷺble regarding charity collections, and this was also the policy of the caliphs after him ﷺ(34).

The fourth duty: Facilitating means of livelihood, providing security, building roads, and similar matters. Discussion of these issues is extensive and would be better treated in a separate study.

The reality:

After this foundation, the question arises: has the system fulfilled these legal duties and acted in accordance with them?

In the matter of establishing justice, that state is almost among the worst in the world in terms of **zulm (oppression)**, violation of rights, and discrimination among people—whether **zulm**

(oppression) committed by the state itself or by influential individuals within it. It is among the last places where one might expect justice and equality to be realized. The system of the country is fundamentally based on privileging members of the ruling family over the general population, granting them all rights, exempting them from all obligations, giving them immunity from **qada (judiciary)**, and allowing them to insult people, consume their wealth, violate their honor, and even kill them. The value of a person decreases the further he is from

the ruling family, to the point that some people are reduced to conditions resembling servitude, as is the case for some imported workers from Muslim countries, or some inhabitants of remote regions living without identity or recognition.

As for **zulm (oppression)** committed directly by the state, it is widespread: speaking the truth is prohibited; gathering and cooperating for righteousness is prohibited; even striving to collect charity for good causes is prohibited. Meanwhile, acts prohibited by the **Sharia (Islamic law)**—such as humiliation, imprisonment, intimidation, torture, surveillance, and home raids—are practiced regularly, becoming the norm. Individuals no longer have privacy in

their homes or phones, nor the ability to fulfill their religious duties freely. In order to complete this system of oppression, the **qada (judiciary)** has been paralyzed, controlled tightly by the state, and turned into a tool to legitimize **zulm (oppression)** and cover crimes. The judiciary has become one of the sharpest weapons against justice. Whoever wants a full picture of this may refer to reports on the state of rights and the **qada (judiciary)** in the kingdom(35).

As for public wealth—its collection and expenditure—no one is known to have committed greater wrongdoing in this regard than Fahd and his brothers. History will record that Fahd squandered one of the greatest financial resources of the Muslim **ummah (community)**, consumed wealth

unlawfully through taxes, levies, and interest-based borrowing despite the country's immense natural wealth, and spent it unjustly on himself, his relatives, associates, and even enemies of Islam and Muslims. The state moved from a surplus of hundreds of billions of dollars to debts of similar magnitude. The wealth of the ruling family abroad has been estimated at hundreds of billions, with Fahd alone possessing tens of billions, and others similarly holding vast amounts. Is this the fulfillment of the legal duty of preserving wealth? It is ironic that they boast about maintaining the Sacred House and decorating the Kaaba with pure gold, while scholars have stated that such acts constitute misuse of Muslim wealth; some even considered it a clear sin and included it among practices condemned in the verse: "The

Day when it will be heated in the fire of Hell…" (At-Tawbah, 35)(36).

As for appointing the strong and trustworthy, there is scarcely any country in the world that has effectively become like a private company divided among one family as in this case. How can the strict prohibition of appointing relatives and the emphasis on appointing the strong and trustworthy be reconciled with the assignment of positions to family members and their relatives across all areas of authority? Positions are given to some of the most corrupt and least trustworthy individuals, placing them in sensitive roles—financial, military, political, intelligence, and even religious. These individuals are then granted immunity from accountability, full protection from questioning, and assurance that

their positions will not be threatened. In fact, their reward for wrongdoing is often continued power, promotion, and greater status.

One of the clearest examples is the minister of defense, whose mismanagement weakened the military, whose failures were exposed during the Gulf crisis, yet he was met with honor and respect. Later, further failures led to continued expansion of his authority. Where is accountability and punishment? Where is accountability for the many influential figures who abused their power among princes, ministers, and officials? It appears that these duties are not merely neglected but completely reversed—positions are granted not to those qualified, but often to those unfit, and those who misuse authority are rewarded and encouraged.

After this, a rational person must ask: what have the rulers actually done to deserve legitimacy? How can such legitimacy even exist? They have neither fulfilled religious obligations nor provided proper worldly governance. It is difficult to understand how authority can be justified when the essential purposes of leadership—both religious and worldly—have been undermined, and governance has been turned into absolute personal control. The question remains: how long will some students of knowledge continue to accept this contradiction, convincing themselves of legitimacy despite clear textual evidence and observable reality?

Footnotes of the duties toward the subjects

1. Narrated by al-Bukhari and Muslim.
2. Narrated by al-Bukhari.
3. Narrated by Muslim.
4. Narrated by Muslim.
5. Reported by Muslim and al-Bukhari in the Book of **al-Mazalim (oppressions)**.
6. Agreed upon.
7. Narrated by Ahmad and al-Bukhari with similar wording.
8. Narrated by Ahmad, al-Bazzar, and al-Darimi; al-Haythami said its chain is good.
9. Tafsir Ibn Kathir, 1/167.
10. Al-Jassas, Ahkam al-Qur'an, 1/69–70.
11. Previous reference, 1/69–70.
12. Al-Qurtubi, Al-Jami' li Ahkam al-Qur'an, 1/109.
13. Narrated by Muslim.
14. Narrated by the two Shaykhs (al-Bukhari and Muslim).
15. Narrated by al-Tabarani; al-Haythami said its narrators are trustworthy.
16. Ibn Taymiyyah, Minhaj al-Sunnah, 1/32.
17. Ibn Taymiyyah, al-Siyasah al-Shar'iyyah, p. 3.
18. See Ibn al-Qayyim, I'lam al-Muwaqqi'in, beginning of the third volume.
19. Ibn Taymiyyah, al-Hisbah, p. 4.
20. Previous reference, p. 94.
21. Narrated by al-Bukhari.
22. Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani, Fath al-Bari, 7/27.
23. Abu Ya'la al-Farra', al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyyah, p. 28.
24. Ibn al-Jawzi, Manaqib 'Umar, p. 350.
25. Reported by Abu Dawud, and by Ahmad in al-Musnad with different wording.
26. Al-Mawardi, al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyyah, p. 71.
27. Ibn Taymiyyah, al-Siyasah al-Shar'iyyah, pp. 37–38.
28. Previous reference, p. 14.
29. Narrated by al-Hakim, who

authenticated it.

30. Ibn al-Jawzi, Manaqib ‘Umar, p. 58.
31. Narrated by al-Bukhari; see al-Bukhari with Fath al-Bari, vol. 11, p. 279.
32. Al-Mawardi, al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyyah, p. 70.
33. Ibn Taymiyyah, al-Siyasah al-Shar ‘iyyah, pp. 9–10.
34. Narrated by Muslim in the Book of **al-Imarah (leadership)**, and by al-Bukhari in **al-Iman (faith)** and **al-Nudhur (vows)**.
35. “Human Rights in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia,” a special report issued by **Lajnat al-Huquq (Human Rights Organization)** on the occasion of the Second World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna, Austria, 14–25 June 1993.
36. See Sadiq Hasan Khan, al-Kayl al-Karamah, p. 118.

The ruling on those who alter the Sharia and those who defend them

The discussion was about the legal foundation of what legitimate authority should be, and about the performance of the Saudi system through that

perspective. The reader now has before him an attempt to determine the position of the system according to Islamic evaluation, supported by legal evidence and the statements of reliable scholars, and what follows from that in terms of the **mawqif (position)** of the **ummah (community)** toward it and toward those who defend it. For this purpose, the main points of the previous pages have been summarized.

First: It has been established through documented reality and observable practical application that the Saudi system has enacted many laws that constitute a complete form of legislation opposing the **shari‘ah (Islamic law)**, including making lawful and unlawful, permitting and prohibiting, and assigning

punishments. It has established courts and bodies for this and enforced their rulings through the power of authority. It has also become clear, through the **naql (transmission)** of legal texts and the statements of scholars, that this act is

major disbelief that expels from the religion by consensus of the scholars. The doubts raised regarding this have been addressed:

The first doubt: the claim that this is minor disbelief. The statement of Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrahim الله رحمهhas been previously cited in refuting this, where he clearly distinguished between one who rules by other than what Allah revealed due to negligence, interpretation, desire, or whim in some situations—thus committing minor disbelief (according to one view)—and one who enacts laws, equates them with the Sharia, and establishes courts for them. He explicitly described this as major disbelief, stating: "…indeed, among the clear major disbelief is to take the accursed law as equal to what the

Trustworthy Spirit brought down…," and he said in another place: "…what disbelief could be greater than this disbelief, and what contradiction to the **shahadah (testimony of faith)** that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah could be greater than this contradiction…"(1).

The second: The claim of some of the defenders of the system that this action is not **kufr (disbelief)** unless the one who does it believes in it. The Qur'an has responded to this by His saying تعالى: "Have you not seen those who claim that they have believed in what was revealed to you and what was revealed before you? They wish to refer judgment to the **taghut (false authority)** while they were commanded to reject it, and Satan wishes to lead them far astray" (An-

Nisa, 60). It has also been نقل(transmitted) from Shaykh ‘Abd al-Rahman ibn Hasan Aal al-Shaykh in its interpretation that he said: “…whoever goes against what Allah and His Messenger ﷺ commanded by judging between الناس(people) with other than what Allah revealed, or seeks that following his desires, has removed the bond of Islam from his neck even if he claims to be a believer…”(2). It has also been نقل(transmitted) from Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrahim in its interpretation: “His saying ‘they claim’ proves their falsehood in what they claim of **iman (faith)**, for referring judgment to other than what the Prophet ﷺ brought cannot coexist with faith in the heart of a servant at all…”(3).

And regarding those who claim that one

may rule by **qawanin (man-made laws)** without believing in them, it has been pointed out that the excuse of ignorance is not valid due to the establishment of proof against the rulers through repeated denunciations of this act. It is also emphasized that the proof has not only been established against the rulers, but also against the scholars who defend them, as the reality of these legislations and courts has been clarified to them in a way that leaves no excuse. Yet they did not suffice with merely concealing the truth and failing to condemn those who ruled by other than what Allah revealed; rather, they actively sought to justify the rulers and affirm that they are implementing the Sharia and ruling by what Allah revealed with enthusiasm and insistence. They also raised their voices in condemning those who denounce this

grave act. Such people should be reminded of what Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhab said about those in his time who defended those who ruled by customs and tribal laws under the claim that they appeared Muslim. He الله رحمه said: “…indeed, these **tawaghit (false authorities)** whom people believe must be obeyed besides Allah are all disbelievers who have apostatized from Islam. How could that not be when they permit what Allah has forbidden and forbid what Allah has permitted, spreading فساد(corruption) in the land by their judgment and support? Whoever argues on their behalf, or rejects declaring them disbelievers, or claims that their actions—even if false—do not take them out of Islam, then the least that can be said about such a person is that he is a **fasiq (sinful person)**, because the religion of

Islam is not valid except by disavowing these and
declaring them disbelievers…”(4). So if merely refraining from declaring them disbelievers is considered a grave offense by Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhab, then what about

those who describe them with praiseworthy Islamic qualities, justify their state and system, and attack those who oppose them?

The third: It has been established through documented reality that the ruling system's relations are based on loyalty to the enemies of Islam and hostility toward Muslims, supporting their enemies against them. It has been shown through the presented examples that hostility toward Muslims and alliance with their enemies is the norm, not the exception.
Matters even reached the point where the system handed over preachers who had sought refuge in the sanctuary to tyrants of their countries, who then tortured and killed them. It has also been shown through the legal texts and the statements of scholars that such

actions take one out of Islam. Among the statements of scholars on this issue is the saying of Ibn Hazm in the interpretation of His saying تعالى: “And whoever among you allies with them—then
indeed, he is one of them” (Al-Ma’idah, 51): “This is upon its apparent meaning—that he is a disbeliever among the disbelievers, and this is true with no اختلاف(disagreement) among Muslims”(5). Shaykh ‘Abdullah ibn ‘Abd al-Latif Aal al-Shaykh explicitly declared the apostasy of one who does this, saying: “Whoever submits to the disbelievers, enters into their obedience, and manifests loyalty to them has waged war against Allah and His Messenger, apostatized from Islam, and jihad against him becomes obligatory…”(6). Likewise, Shaykh Hamad ibn ‘Atiq said: “…the Qur’an

and Sunnah have indicated that if a Muslim shows loyalty to the people of shirk and inclines toward them, he apostatizes بذلك(by that) from the religion…”(7). Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhab counted this among the **nawaqid al-Islam (nullifiers of Islam)**, saying: “…showing loyalty to the polytheist, relying on him, supporting and aiding him by hand and tongue…”(8).

It has been established through examining real examples of the system’s relations that there is genuine and complete loyalty to the enemies of Islam, open support for them against Muslims, plotting against Muslims, and striving to weaken them. Unfortunately, those who defend the system among scholars of authority and others know these details well, and they know that

these relations are not merely matters of necessity or minimizing harm. Yet they have not only refrained from condemning them and clarifying the truth to the **ummah (community)**, but they have insisted on praising them and describing them as protectors of Islam and defenders of its causes. This constitutes a betrayal of the duty of clarification, misleading the ummah, and deception of Muslims. This crime is far greater than merely remaining silent about condemning such a great wrong.

Thirdly: It has been established through documented reality that the system has suspended the established rituals of Islam proven by the Qur'an, Sunnah, and consensus of the ummah, and has even acted contrary to them. Among these rituals is the obligation of

jihad at its minimum level—defending the territory and protecting the frontiers. It has been established that the system deliberately weakened the military and relied completely on enemies of Islam for protection, granting them control over Muslim lands. Likewise, the system has nullified the prohibition of **riba (usury)**; it not only permitted and supported it with state policy, making it the foundation of its economic dealings, but also prevented the establishment of Islamic banks and the publication of scholarly verdicts against usurious banks.

The system has also nullified the duty of **amr bil ma‘ruf wa nahi ‘an al-munkar (enjoining good and forbidding evil)**, turning instead into a system that suppresses الدعوة(religious

call), imprisons scholars and preachers, obstructs the transmission of truth to the ummah, and facilitates the spread of falsehood, corruption, and deviation. It has implemented what is called programs of “drying the sources,” isolating the ummah from its religion and values. It

has been clarified from the statements of scholars that those who persist in suspending an established ritual of Islam are treated as rebellious groups. Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said: "…any group that claims Islam yet refuses to adhere to some of its manifest and well-known obligations must be fought by consensus of the Muslims…"(9). He also said: "…any group that refuses some of the obligatory prayers, fasting, الحج(pilgrimage), or refuses to adhere to the prohibition of bloodshed, wealth violation, alcohol, adultery, or refuses jihad against disbelievers, or the imposition of jizyah upon the People of the Book, and other obligations and prohibitions for which there is no excuse in denying—such a group is to be fought even if they acknowledge them…"(10).

Thus, mere acknowledgment is not sufficient—implementation is required. Those who defend the system among scholars of authority and others are aware of all these realities: the state of the military, the presence of foreign forces in the Arabian Peninsula, the reality of riba and the banning of Islamic banking, and what is done to الدعوةand its people. Yet despite all this, they continue to justify the system and attack those who oppose it, not even limiting themselves to silence regarding its violations and abandonment of these rituals.

Fourth: It has been established through documented reality that the system has nullified its duties toward the **ra‘iyyah (subjects)**, the most important of which are justice, appointing trustworthy

individuals, and preserving public wealth. It has been proven that **zulm (oppression)** has spread widely—whether by the state itself or by influential individuals. It has also been established that appointments are made based on kinship and connection to the ruling family and loyalty to it, rather than on **quwwah (competence/strength)** and **amanah (trustworthiness)**. It has likewise been established that public wealth is collected, preserved, and spent through unlawful means. The system has squandered one of the greatest financial resources in the history of the **ummah (community)** and committed a major strategic crime by burdening the الأمةwith massive debts and responsibility for repayment, despite the great resources Allah has granted this land.

It has become clear from the transmitted legal texts how grave these crimes are and how they are a direct and powerful cause of destruction and worldly punishment. Those who defend the system are fully aware of all these details, yet they did not suffice with remaining silent about those who committed **zulm (oppression)**, appointed corrupt individuals, and misused the wealth of Allah; rather, they justified all of this reality, described the rulers with qualities of justice and trustworthiness, and attacked those who opposed them. What betrayal could be greater than this, and what deception of the **ummah (community)** could be worse?

Important note:

To prevent confusion and

argumentation, the objection to legitimacy is not based on the issue of a ruler seizing power without the consent of Muslims, nor on the issue of personal sinfulness, injustice, or مجرد**zulm (oppression)**, nor on shortcomings in fulfilling some duties. Rather, it is based on the complete تعطيل(nullification) of the foundations of governance in Islam, for which leadership was originally established—foremost among them ruling by what Allah has revealed, manifesting Islam, upholding the دين(religion) of Allah, and establishing the supremacy of the **shari‘ah (Islamic law)**.

The scholars differed regarding the legitimacy of one who seizes power, or one who is personally corrupt or unjust, as long as he upholds the **shari‘ah (Islamic law)** and adheres to the Qur’an and Sunnah in the foundations of his

state. However, they did not differ that leadership which nullifies these obligations, turns away from the حكم(rule) of Allah, and

allies with the enemies of Allah is not legitimate leadership. The rule of one who seizes power is only valid if he fulfills the legal duties of leadership and does not commit actions that nullify it. But if he abandons those duties and commits the **nawaqid (nullifiers)** of the **shari‘ah (Islamic law)**, then his authority becomes invalid in itself and cannot be corrected by anything.

Those who insist on reducing the issue of legitimacy to the person of the ruler and judging him merely by the ظاهر(outward appearance) of Islam are avoiding the reality and suspending all these legal texts, as if the Qur’an and Sunnah came as optional ideals rather than binding obligations. Even if their argument were accepted and the issue were limited to the

legitimacy of the individual ruler or the group with him, then that individual or group is directly responsible for these crimes which scholars have classified as acts that expel from the religion. The statement of Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhab regarding their ruling and his ruling on those who defend them has already been mentioned(11).

Those who insist on affirming legitimacy have no option except to abandon judgment by the Qur’an and Sunnah and instead follow desires and whims. What Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhab said regarding them is sufficient. As for their defense and argumentation with falsehood, it amounts to committing multiple grave crimes. Whoever reflects on the condition of some scholars in the land of the two sanctuaries who aligned

themselves with the system will observe that they are involved in a chain of such offenses:

The first crime: Concealing knowledge and remaining silent about clarifying the truth regarding these violations of the **shari‘ah (Islamic law)**, which are definitively established and known in the **din (religion)** by necessity. The one who conceals knowledge deserves the curse of Allah according to the Qur’an, and his repentance is not accepted except after clarification and rectification. Allah تعالىsaid: “Indeed, those who conceal what We have revealed of clear proofs and guidance after We made it clear for the people in the Book—those are cursed by Allah and cursed by those who curse, except those who repent, correct themselves, and make it clear—

those I will accept their repentance, and I am the Accepting of repentance, the Merciful" (Al-Baqarah, 159–160).

The second crime: Refraining from reform and abandoning the obligations of **fard kifayah (communal obligations)** in establishing the general duties of the **shari'ah (Islamic law)**. It has been established in the Qur'an and Sunnah that abandoning reform and failing to change **munkar (evil)** is a grave sin and leads to worldly punishment. The story of the people of the Sabbath is well known—those who merely avoided committing the sin themselves were not saved; rather, punishment afflicted them collectively.

The third crime: Praising the wrongdoers, commending them, defending them, and searching for

juristic justifications to legitimize their actions. In reality, this amounts to **shahadat al-zur (false testimony)** in its fullest sense, because such praise misleads the **ummah (community)** and deceives Muslims, leading to trials, misguidance, and distortion of the **din (religion)**. The trust placed upon a scholar regarding his knowledge and conveying the ruling of Allah in matters of life is far greater than the trust of a witness in an individual incident. Do those who praise and defend the system realize that they are committing such a grave crime?

The fourth crime: Attacking those who condemn wrongdoing and speak the truth, persisting in such attacks, raising voices against them, and attributing to them blameworthy labels to

justify this—such as "**khawarij (extremist rebels)**," "those who cause fitnah," "agitators," or that their intentions are corrupt, and other such accusations. Defenders of the system among scholars of authority have persisted in this behavior until it has become a routine practice, almost as if it were a دين(religion) they follow. How many preachers and speakers have been dismissed or imprisoned due to such actions? How many official statements have been issued to discredit reformers—from letters of demands to memoranda of advice to defense committees? People have read what was written about certain scholars and the calls urging the state to "protect society from their mistakes." How can one ask a ruler who neglects the **shari'ah (Islamic law)** to protect society from the supposed errors of

reformers?

"…to protect society from their mistakes." So how can you ask a ruler who has suspended the **shari'ah (Islamic law)** to protect society from the mistakes of scholars of truth.

If such crimes are committed by those whom Allah has blessed with knowledge of the Qur'an and Sunnah, then it becomes clear that these people are in greater danger than the rulers themselves, because the rulers rely on them to justify what they do, to present it as acceptable to الناس(people), and also rely on them in the war against reform and reformers. Do these individuals truly realize the magnitude of this danger and these crimes?

If they do not know, then all of this

stands as testimony against them before Allah and then before the **ummah (community)**, that the proof has been established against them previously and repeatedly, and their knowledge and limbs will testify against them before Allah on the Day of Judgment for all these crimes: “The Day when neither wealth nor children will benefit, except one who comes to Allah with a sound heart” (Ash-Shu‘ara, 88–89).

And if they do know, then they are no different from the Jews who incurred غضب(wrath), who knew the truth but turned away from it—and this type is among the most dangerous to Islam… and we seek refuge in Allah.

Footnotes on the ruling of those who alter the shari‘ah (Islamic law) and those who defend them

1. See Muhammad ibn Ibrahim, *Risalat Tahkim al-Qawanin (Treatise on judging by man-made laws)*, p. 5.
2. See *Fath al-Majid (Opening of the Glorious)*, p. 393.
3. See Muhammad ibn Ibrahim, *Risalat Tahkim al-Qawanin (Treatise on judging by man-made laws)*, p. 80.
4. Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhab, *al-Rasa’il al-Shakhsiyyah (Personal letters)*, p. 188.
5. Ibn Hazm, *al-Muhalla*, vol. 13, p. 35.
6. See *al-Durar al-Saniyyah*, vol. 7, p. 11.
7. Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhab, *Majmu’at al-Tawhid (Collection on monotheism)*, p. 29; and see *al-Rasa’il wa al-Masa’il al-Najdiyyah*, vol. 2, pp. 124–135.
8. See *al-Rasa’il wa al-Masa’il al-Najdiyyah*, vol. 1, p. 745.
9. Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Siyasah al-Shar‘iyyah (Governance according to shari‘ah)*, p. 108.
10. Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Fatawa (Legal verdicts)*, vol. 28, p. 503.
11. Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhab, *Majmu’at al-Tawhid (Collection on monotheism)*,

p. 29.

“Duties of the ummah (community) toward the niẓām (system/regime)”

The legal status of the current **niẓām (system/regime)** of governance has already been discussed through

examining the legal evidences and the statements of scholars, and applying them to the reality of that system and its practices. This discussion is not a matter of intellectual luxury or rhetorical debate; rather, it entails multiple legal obligations and rulings upon the Muslim. A Muslim worships Allah as Allah intended, and this can only be achieved when the Muslim adheres to the قول(statement) of Allah and the statement of His Messenger .malsI fo dohtem eht si sihT .mih ot niatrep taht snoitagilbo lagel eht dna ,ﷺ

As for blindly following religious authorities and placing responsibility upon them, that is the method of the Jews and Christians, not the method of Muslims. We are bound to follow what Allah سبحانهintended and what His

Messenger ﷺ intended, and we follow among the scholars those who truly represent Allah’s guidance—those whose intent aligns with the intent of

Allah and His Messenger ﷺ. As for those who argue on behalf of the **ṭawāghīt (false authorities)**, defend the oppressors, or evade their legal responsibility by repeating vague generalities not grounded in the **shari‘ah (Islamic law)**, or by clinging to historical precedents that the الأمة(community) has agreed are not valid legal evidence—such people have gone astray and led others astray, and their arguments will not stand before “Allah said” and “the Messenger said.”

The Muslim, in all circumstances, when faced with an issue, is commanded to strive for his دين(religion) and seek to arrive at the truth through adherence to the Qur’an and Sunnah according to the understanding of the righteous predecessors. Therefore, determining

the legal obligations that arise from understanding reality must be strictly governed by **shar‘i (legal)** principles.

Since the discussion concerns legal obligations, the scholars regarding the issue of the **niẓām (system/regime)** fall into three categories:

The first category: Those who conclude that the system is not legitimate due to its complete nullification of the objectives of leadership in Islam—rather, acting contrary to them—especially because it has committed a major cause of illegitimacy, namely enacting **tashri‘at kufriyyah (disbelieving legislations)** and imposing them upon the people.

The second category: Those who agree with everything stated about the violation of the objectives of leadership

in Islam in the previously mentioned details, but stop at that point and hesitate to conclude that the system is illegitimate. This hesitation is due to their understanding of certain hadiths and scholarly statements that emphasize obedience even to a sinful or unjust ruler.

The third category: Those who do not agree at all with what has been stated, and claim that the **niẓām (system/regime)** is fulfilling whatever it can of the legal obligations, that it is keen on serving Islam and Muslims and defending the **din (religion)**, and that what appears to people as crimes are in reality matters of **ijtihad (independent reasoning)** in which a ruler may err. As for the rest, they consider it to be individual sin and human **zulm (oppression)** that is unavoidable and

does not affect legitimacy or the foundations and objectives of leadership.

In response to the claims of this third category, it has been established beyond doubt that this group of scholars and students of knowledge commits a crime greater than that of the ruler himself, due to the confusion, misguidance, and تعطيل(suspension) of legal obligations they create among the **ummah (community)**. By their actions, they are closer to cooperation in sin and transgression. Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله said: "…it is not permissible for a person to be an assistant in ظلم(oppression). Cooperation is of two types: the first is cooperation upon righteousness and piety—such as jihad, establishing prescribed punishments, fulfilling

rights, and giving people their due. This is what Allah and His Messenger commanded. Whoever refrains from it out of fear of being considered among the helpers of the oppressors has abandoned an obligation—either individual or communal—thinking himself to be cautious, whereas often cowardice and ضعف(weakness) are mistaken for piety… The second is cooperation upon sin and transgression, such as assisting in shedding unlawful blood, consuming unlawful wealth, or harming one who does not deserve harm. This is what Allah and His Messenger have forbidden…”(1).

It is known that issuing fatwas and statements to justify the ruler's actions—such as imprisoning, silencing, or accusing preachers, and misleading the **ummah (community)** by praising the ruler—goes far beyond merely assisting in wrongdoing; it is clearly a form of cooperation in **ithm (sin)** and transgression. The scholar among them bears a greater burden, because he knows both the reality and the **shari'ah (Islamic law)**. If he persists in arguing and defending falsehood after its truth has become clear, then he falls under the warning of the Prophet ﷺ: "Whoever argues for falsehood while knowing it remains under the anger of Allah until he stops"(2). Persisting in defending oppressors and justifying their crimes is
persistence in a major sin, and

persistence in major sin is a grave matter—especially when the proof has already been established. Such individuals are among the helpers of the oppressors, and perhaps even among the oppressors themselves if they hold positions of القضاء(judiciary), ifta (legal verdicts), or authority, and assist injustice through their rulings, fatwas, or power.

It is reported that one of the prison guards asked Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal رحمه اللهwhether he was among the helpers of the oppressors. Imam Ahmad replied: “Rather, you are among the oppressors themselves.” It is also reported in the hadith of Ka‘b ibn ‘Ujrah that the Prophet ﷺ said: “There will be rulers after me; whoever enters upon them, believes their lies, and assists them in their ظلم(oppression) is

not from me and I am not from him, and he will not come to my **hawd (prophetic basin)**. And whoever does not enter upon them, does not assist them in their oppression, and does not affirm their lies is from me and I am from him, and he will come to my basin”(3). This, then, is the ruling regarding the third category according to the legal evidences.

As for the **second category**, they have a doubt based on hadiths and scholarly statements regarding obedience to the ruler, but the clarity of reality and the abundance of evidence are sufficient to correct their position.

As for the legal obligations that follow from understanding the reality of the system, they can be summarized as follows:

First: What is obligatory upon individuals is condemnation in the heart—**inkar bil-qalb (denouncing evil in the heart)**. It has been established as an individual obligation in the
authentic hadith: “Whoever among you sees a **munkar (evil)** should change it with his hand; if he cannot, then with his tongue; if he cannot, then with his heart—and that is the weakest of **iman (faith)**”(4). In another narration: “There is nothing beyond that of faith even equal to a mustard seed.” Ibn Hazm transmitted consensus that condemnation in the heart is an individual obligation(5). Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah connected this with the أصل (foundation) of faith, stating that the complete absence of condemnation in the heart
contradicts faith, based on this same

hadith: "…as for the heart, it is obligatory in all circumstances since there is no harm in it; and whoever does not do it is not a believer, as the Prophet ﷺ said: 'that is the weakest of faith,' and 'there is nothing beyond that of faith even a mustard seed'"(6). The issue of **inkār bil-qalb (condemning evil in the heart)** itself has implications: it is not valid unless it is reflected in not supporting or being pleased with the **munkar (evil)**. It is not permissible for someone to claim that he has rejected something in his heart while he covers for the oppressors, assists them, beautifies their image, attends their gatherings without objection, and perhaps even defends and argues on their behalf. All of this contradicts the claim of **inkār bil-qalb (inner rejection)** and affects a person's **īmān (faith)**. The Prophet ﷺ said: "If a

sin is committed on earth, then the one who witnesses it and rejects it is like one who was absent from it, and the one who was absent but is pleased with it is like one who witnessed it”(7).

Although condemning with the heart ensures safety in the Hereafter, it does not guarantee protection from worldly punishment that results from failing to change wrongdoing. This is indicated by the distinction made by the Prophet ﷺ between the one who rejects and is safe, and the one who merely dislikes it. In the authentic hadith, he ﷺ said: "There will be rulers; you will recognize and reject. Whoever hates it is absolved, and whoever rejects it is safe, but whoever is pleased and follows…"(8). This is also reflected in the story of the people of the Sabbath: "And when a group among them said: Why do you advise a people whom Allah will destroy or punish severely? They said: As an excuse before your Lord and perhaps they may fear Him. So when they forgot what they had been reminded of, We saved those who

forbade evil and seized those who did wrong with a severe punishment…" (Al-A'raf 164–165). The rejecters were saved, while the wrongdoers and—according to one opinion—the silent ones were destroyed. In another hadith: "Allah does not punish the العامة(general people) for the actions of the elite until they see wrongdoing among them and are able to change it but do not; then Allah punishes both the elite and the العامة(general people)"(9).

Secondly: Among individual obligations is also rallying around sincere scholars—the reformers who strive, enjoin good, and forbid evil. Ibn al-'Arabi said in his commentary on Sunan al-Tirmidhi: "…Ibn al-Mubarak meant by 'the **jama'ah (community)**' the one who upholds the pillars of the religion, and that is found in a just ruler

or a knowledgeable man; he is the jama‘ah. This is correct, for Islam began as something strange and will return as
something strange, and its jama‘ah is knowledge and justice…”(10). Imam al-Haramayn said: “…matters are entrusted to the scholars, and it is obligatory upon all people, regardless of their levels, to refer back to their scholars”(11).

Thirdly: As for **fard kifayah (communal obligations)** in this matter, they revolve around three duties:

1. Clarifying the truth to people and exposing falsehood so that they are not misled by the practices of rulers and people of influence, and so that truth is not confused with falsehood.
2. Striving to establish the neglected communal obligations through all

legitimate means.

3. Striving to change outward wrongdoing according to one's ability.

Regarding the obligation of clarification, Allah تعالىsays: "And [remember] when Allah took a covenant from those who were given the Scripture that you must make it clear to the people and not conceal it…" (Aal 'Imran, 187), and He says: "Indeed, those who conceal what Allah has revealed of clear proofs and guidance after We made it clear to the people in the Book—those are cursed by Allah and cursed by those who curse" (Al-Baqarah, 159). Ibn Kathir رحمه اللهsaid in its explanation: "…this is a severe warning against those who conceal what the messengers brought of clear signs and beneficial guidance after Allah clarified it to His servants in His Books…" and he said: "…just as

everything seeks forgiveness for the scholar—even the fish in water and birds in the sky—these, in contrast, are cursed by Allah and cursed by those who curse… except those who repent, reform, and clarify…”(12).

In the authentic narration from Abu Hurayrah, he said: “Were it not for a verse in the Book of Allah, I would not have narrated anything,” and he mentioned the verse “Indeed, those who conceal…” The Prophet ﷺ also said: “Whoever is asked about knowledge and conceals it will be bridled with a bridle of fire on the Day of Resurrection”(13).

It has already been explained that the الأمة(community) is obligated to fulfill communal duties, and that a group must undertake them so that the sin is lifted from the rest. The same applies to **amr bil-ma‘ruf wa nahi ‘an al-munkar (enjoining good and forbidding evil)**. It has been repeatedly emphasized that neglecting these duties does not only bring sin in the Hereafter but also leads to worldly punishment such as destruction and calamities.

Among the important realities often neglected by Muslims—even students of knowledge—is that the الأمة(community) as a whole is responsible for fulfilling what is required by the **shari‘ah (Islamic law)**, not the ruler alone. The أصل(basis) of responsibility lies with the الأمة(community); the ruler

only implements the commands of Allah as a representative. Those who remove responsibility from the الأمة(community) contradict the clear methodology of Islam. Therefore, in cases of اختلاف(disagreement), the reference is to the Qur'an and Sunnah as understood by the الأمة(community), not merely by the ruler.

Those who prevent the الأمة(community) from holding the ruler accountable are closer to the doctrine of those who claim infallibility for leaders. Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah refuted this in *Minhaj al-Sunnah*, saying: "…we do not accept that the imam must be the sole guardian of the law; rather, the الأمة(community) must preserve the law…"(14). He also said: "…the infallibility of the الأمة(community) suffices in place of the

infallibility of an individual, and this is among the wisdoms mentioned by scholars—for previous nations, when they altered their religion, a prophet would be sent to clarify the truth, but this الأمة (community) has no prophet after its Prophet, so its collective infallibility takes the place of prophethood…"(15). He also said: "The consensus of the الأمة(community) is truth; the الأمة does not unite upon misguidance…" (Aal 'Imran, 110)(16).

Therefore, those who accuse reformers of dividing unity are, in reality, calling for unity upon falsehood. This contradicts Allah's command: "And hold firmly to the rope of Allah all together and do not be divided" (Aal 'Imran, 103). Unity is not مجرد(mere) gathering; it must be upon the rope of Allah. Those who call for unity under

nationalism or other banners resemble those who claim that religion divides people within a nation.

In conclusion, these are only general indications, brief notes, and broad entry points. It is obligatory upon the Muslim to strive with all his ability—and with whatever Allah has granted him of material strength, physical capacity, influence, position, relationships, or status—to utilize them in fulfilling **fard kifayah (communal obligations)** and eliminating **munkar (evil)**. And we ask Allah to assist us in fulfilling His obligations and avoiding His prohibitions.

Footnotes on the duties of the ummah (community) toward the niẓām (system/regime)

1. Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Siyasah al-*

Shar‘iyyah (Governance according to shari‘ah), pp. 56–57.

2. Narrated by Abu Dawud in his Sunan.
3. Reported by Imam Ahmad, al-Tirmidhi, al-Nasa’i, and Ibn Hibban in his Sahih.
4. Reported by al-Shaykhan (al-Bukhari and Muslim), and also by Abu Dawud and al-Tirmidhi from Abu Hurayrah; see *al-Taj al-Jami‘ lil-Usul*, vol. 5, p. 41.
5. Ibn Hazm, *Maratib al-Ijma‘ (Ranks of consensus)*, p. 176.
6. Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Fatawa (Legal verdicts)*, vol. 28, p. 127; and see Ibn Hazm in *Kitab al-Ijma‘*.
7. Narrated by Abu Dawud.

8. Narrated by Muslim; see also al-Nawawi's commentary on this hadith in *Sharh Sahih Muslim*, vol. 12, p. 226.
9. Narrated by Ahmad with a good chain.
10. Ibn al-'Arabi, *Tuhfat al-Ahwadhi*, vol. 11, p. 9.
11. Imam al-Haramayn al-Juwayni, *Ghiyath al-Umam*, p. 39.
12. Ibn Kathir, *Tafsir Ibn Kathir*, vol. 1, pp. 352–353.
13. Narrated by the authors of the Sunan—Abu Dawud, al-Tirmidhi, and al-Nasa'i—and also reported by Imam Ahmad in his Musnad.
14. Ibn Taymiyyah, *Minhaj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3, p. 270.
15. Previous reference, vol. 3, p. 272.
16. Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Rasa'il al-Kubra (Major epistles)*, vol. 1, p. 191.

Doubts and Responses

There is no doubt that a discussion of such a serious and sensitive topic will raise some questions and bring about certain **shubuhat (doubts)** among a group of people, due to what has become ingrained in their minds from misconceptions built on faulty premises. Therefore, it is necessary to examine these **shubuhat (doubts)** and understand their reality in order to

arrive at the truth.

The first doubt

Some students of knowledge claim that the rule of the Āl Sa‘ūd does not differ from governance during the early Umayyad period, and that despite ظلم(oppression) and فسق (sinfulness) present at that time, the companions and followers did not challenge the legitimacy of that rule. The response to this weak doubt is from several angles:

First point: No fair-minded person denies what occurred at the hands of the Umayyad caliphs in terms of ظلم(oppression) and bloodshed. However, it is not established that those caliphs enacted non-Islamic laws, legislated systems contrary to the **shari‘ah (Islamic law)**, or replaced it.

Nor is it established that the loyalty and disavowal of the state were directed away from Islam. Islamic rituals—foremost among them jihad—were not suspended. The

distinction has already been made between undermining the foundations of legitimate leadership and merely committing personal sin, injustice, or harshness in dealing with opponents.

Second point: It is not correct that the كبار(leading) companions and followers unanimously accepted the legitimacy of unjust rulers. It is established that many of them opposed the Umayyad authority. The majority of companions rejected the legitimacy of Yazid's leadership and the pledge given to him. It is also established that al-Hasan ibn 'Ali, 'Abdullah ibn al-Zubayr, and others among the companions and followers opposed it. In fact, according to many scholars, 'Abdullah ibn al-Zubayr was the legitimate **khalifah (caliph)**, as the majority of

companions, followers, and people in the Hijaz, Egypt, Africa, Iraq, and the Arabian Peninsula gave allegiance to him, while the Umayyads retained only Syria.

Marwan ibn al-Hakam nearly pledged allegiance to Ibn al-Zubayr, and it was he—and later his son ‘Abd al-Malik—who initially stood in opposition. Later, after Ibn al-Zubayr’s death, people united under ‘Abd al-Malik, and through the majority’s pledge he became the ruler. Some scholars even considered Ibn al-Zubayr’s caliphate part of the rightly guided leadership. There were also uprisings such as the incident of al-Harrah in Madinah, and the revolt of Ibn al-Ash‘ath with many scholars and reciters among the followers. It is also reported that figures like Sa‘id ibn al-Musayyib and

others refused allegiance. ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Aziz even ordered punishment for those who referred to Yazid as “Commander of the Believers,” indicating his عدم إقرار(non-recognition) of his leadership. Ibn Hajar summarized this by stating that revolt by the sword was the position of early scholars. Thus, the claim that the companions and followers universally accepted unjust rulers is incorrect—especially when the discussion here is not merely about ظلم(oppression) but about major
issues such as disbelief, altering the **shari‘ah (Islamic law)**, and suspending religious obligations.

Third point: Nothing in the above discussion necessarily calls for rebellion or armed confrontation in every case. The issue of the legitimacy

of the system is separate from the issue of **khuruj (armed rebellion)**, and each has its own conditions and rulings. If a student of knowledge agrees that legitimate leadership has been undermined, then he is required to strive to establish it through lawful means. Likewise, if he acknowledges the replacement of the **shari‘ah (Islamic law)** and the suspension of religious duties, he must work to change these wrongs through permissible means. Those who label every effort of reform, every statement of truth, and every act of **amr bil-ma‘ruf wa nahi ‘an al-munkar (enjoining good and forbidding evil)** as “rebellion” are mistaken, contradicting clear Qur’anic texts and authentic Sunnah, and speaking about Allah without knowledge.

It is agreed among scholars that if a ruler commands a sin—whether by ordering a prohibited act or abandoning an obligation—he is not to be obeyed in that matter, regardless of whether he is a righteous or unjust ruler, legitimate or illegitimate, ruling by Islam or otherwise. There is also no dispute that a ruler who governs by other than what Allah has revealed is, in legal terms, treated as lacking authority in that regard, and obedience to him is not obligatory in sinful matters. The issue of obedience differs from the issue of armed opposition, which classical jurists defined specifically as rebellion with weapons.

However, when some scholars aligned with السلطة(authority) were unable to respond with evidence and reasoning, they resorted to intellectual intimidation

by repeatedly invoking the term “khuruj (rebellion)” to prevent reformers from fulfilling the duties of sincere advice and

accountability. Yet Allah says: “O People of the Book, why do you mix truth with falsehood and conceal the truth while you know?” (Aal ‘Imran, 71).

The second doubt

Some defenders of the system’s legitimacy argue using what they describe as legal evidences for obeying the imam. However, it is not from the methodology of Ahl al-Sunnah to take some evidences and ignore others. Rather, their method is to consider all evidences together, reconciling what is established in the Qur’an and Sunnah to remove any apparent contradiction and to avoid neglecting any part of revelation. Everything in the Qur’an and Sunnah must be followed, with attention to recognized principles such

as specification and restriction. Those who rely on partial texts while ignoring others resemble those who believe in some parts and reject others, or who distort words from their proper places. Imam al-
Shatibi رحمه الله explained that error arises from failing to understand the objectives of the **shari‘ah (Islamic law)** and from not integrating its evidences as a unified whole(2).

Based on this methodology, the evidences in this matter can be reviewed:

In the Qur’an, Allah تعالى says: “O you who believe, obey Allah, obey the Messenger, and those in authority among you,” followed by: “If you differ in anything, refer it to Allah and the Messenger” (An-Nisa, 59).

As for the hadiths, they fall into three groups:

- The first group appears to command unconditional obedience to rulers.
- The second group indicates that there is no obedience in disobedience to Allah and includes striving against wrongdoing.
- The third group combines both, commanding obedience with conditions.

From the first group is the hadith: “Whoever withdraws from obedience meets Allah without proof, and whoever dies without a pledge dies a death of **jahiliyyah (pre-Islamic ignorance)**”(3), and the hadith: “…even if your back is struck and your wealth is taken, listen and obey”(4). From the second group is the hadith: “…whoever strives against them with his hand is a believer…”(5), and the statement:

“There is no obedience to a created being in disobedience to the Creator”(7).

From the third group is the hadith of ‘Ubadah ibn al-Samit: “…and that we do not dispute authority unless you see **kufr buwah (clear disbelief)** for which you have proof from Allah”(10), and the hadith: “…so long as they establish among you the Book of Allah”(11).

These texts show that obedience is conditional, not absolute. Those who argue for legitimacy often commit several errors:

- They cite “obey those in authority” but ignore the command to refer disputes back to Allah and the Messenger.
- They rely on texts suggesting absolute obedience while ignoring those that restrict it.
- They quote conditional hadiths but omit the conditions—such as the

presence of clear disbelief or the requirement that rulers uphold the Book of Allah.

When all evidences are considered together, it becomes clear that obedience is tied to adherence to the **shari‘ah (Islamic law)** and the establishment of الدين(religion). It is not unconditional.

The third doubt

Some claim that ruling by other than what Allah revealed is not **kufr (disbelief)** unless the person considers it permissible (**istihlal**). This claim has spread in recent times.

The response:

First: Making **istihlal (declaring something permissible)** a condition is an innovation without evidence from the Qur’an or Sunnah. Actions described as disbelief in the texts are

disbelief regardless of whether the doer claims otherwise. This was understood by the companions—for example, in their fighting against those who withheld zakah, even when some acknowledged its obligation(17)(18). Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrahim compared this argument to someone worshipping idols while claiming he believes it is false(19).

Second: Actions such as abandoning حكم(rule) by what Allah revealed or supporting enemies of Islam are themselves described as acts of disbelief, regardless of whether this applies to every individual. These actions are more serious than major sins that are not described as disbelief.

Third: The Muslim is obligated to act according to what is required by the

shari‘ah (Islamic law)—to uphold its principles and obligations—regardless of judgments about individuals.
Even if this claim were accepted, it would not justify abandoning the duty to establish justice, uphold the دين(religion), and implement divine law.

Therefore, this doubt is invalid, and there is no basis for using it to justify legitimacy or to abandon the obligation of reform.

Footnotes on shubuhat (doubts) and responses

1. Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalani, *Tahdhib al-Tahdhib*, vol. 2, p. 288.
2. Al-Shatibi, *al-I‘tisam*, vol. 1, pp. 244–246.
3. Narrated by Muslim.
4. Agreed upon (al-Bukhari and Muslim).
5. Narrated by Muslim.
6. Ibn Rajab al-Hanbali, *Jami‘ al-‘Ulum wa al-Hikam*, p. 304.
7. Narrated by Ibn Majah; also

reported by Ahmad, al-Tabarani, and al-Bayhaqi with similar wording. The hadith was authenticated by Ahmad Shakir and al-Albani.

8. Narrated by Muslim.
9. Reported by al-Tabarani with a good chain.
10. The hadith is agreed upon.
11. Narrated by al-Bukhari.
12. Narrated by Muslim, al-Tirmidhi, and al-Nasa'i.
13. Narrated by Muslim.
14. See *al-Bahr al-Muhit*, vol. 39, p. 278.
15. See Ibn Rajab, *Jami' al-'Ulum wa al-Hikam*, p. 304.
16. Ibn Kathir, *al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah*, vol. 10, p. 304.

17. *al-Musannaf* of Ibn Abi Shaybah, vol. 12, p. 265.
18. *al-Durar al-Saniyyah*, vol. 8, p. 135.
19. *Fatawa Muhammad ibn Ibrahim*, vol. 6, p. 198.

Conclusion (al-khātimah)

By the praise of Allah, this research—based on **adillah shar‘iyyah (legal evidences)** and the statements of reliable scholars—has been completed. The study has presented an evaluation of the Saudi **niẓām (system/regime)** through a detailed examination of the pillars of legitimate leadership in Islam, followed by a comparison with the reality of the system in relation to each of those pillars. It has also discussed the reality of those who defend the system and provided a **shar‘i (legal)** characterization of their actions, and it has addressed and refuted the **shubuhat (doubts)** they raise.

Thus, the issue of legitimacy has been laid out in a manner that establishes the proof against those who defend the system. They are left with no option except to abandon their positions or to

respond with evidence.

What remains for the active **du‘at (callers to Islam)** is to unite their ranks, remain steadfast in their work, and hold firm in their positions. The **ummah (community)** must also assume its responsibilities so that legitimate leadership and the Islamic state may be established upon the guidance of the Qur’an and Sunnah.

We ask Allah to protect us from the trials that mislead, to grant us correctness in speech and action, and our final supplication is: praise be to Allah, Lord of the worlds.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

Words by the translator

Alhamdullilah, Allah made me a means to translate this beneficial book, in a time when the massacres against the Ummah is actively taking place in several regions and may Allah keep the Muslims steadfast on the deen and relieve them of the oppression from the oppressors.

The masses within the Ummah are confused with regards to the majority of the things and the shari' rulings regarding it , to the point the Rawafid state of Iran, whose kufr and enimity against the Ahlus Sunnah is very well known is being seen as a hero and saviour of Gaza, while another group of

people are thinking that the states of Arabian Peninsula and other areas of Sunni majority are the saviours , which is even clear to a child who knows about the reality of the situation.

Speaking with many people I realised that, many are unaware of the deviations of the regimes in the Muslim world clearly and the kufriyath, they have been committed and the real obstacle to the liberation of Palestine and Bayth Al Maqdis in Jerusalem and another group of the individuals and many of them sincere , have fallen into the situation to the point of considering the rulers as legitimate rulers of Islam and many other reasons .

This is the translation of a booklet originally titled “An Nizam As Saudi Fi Mizaanul Islam” (The regimes of Saudi in the scales of Islam) available on the Internet archive .

Remember this is with regards to the deviation of the Third Saudi State and we consider the first two Saudi states to be legitimate and their work of spreading Tawheed and Sunnah in Arabian Peninsula , and may Allah have mercy on the rulers, their ulema and their supporters and we consider them as such.

It is a time where we call the people

towards the Tawheed, Sunnah and Manhaj of Salaf As Salih and expose all kinds of falsehood to the best of our ability.

This booklet might have been written long ago , but the present day events and confusion amongst the Muslim masses and the need for its translation is equally relevant today.

With the Tawakkul in Allah alone, I utilized the AI tools and translated these works, to be shared with the masses, and I request brothers and sisters to physically take copies of this and let it be free of costs and spread it everywhere and also on the social media accounts .

I also request, if any errors are there ,

to take some time to rectify it and publish the updated version on the archive and other platforms.

May Allah forgive me for my mistakes and errors , which might have come intentionally or unintentionally and may he guide us to the truth and may he guide us to the truth and keep us steadfast upon it.

All praises is due to Allah alone and Salah and Salam be upon our beloved , seal of the Prophets, Muhammad ﷺ , his family and his companions (May Allah be pleased with them all)

1st May 2026

13th Dhul Qa’idah 1447